



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 2024

No. 10

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 18, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DERRICK VAN ORDEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

FATE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as we sit here currently, the Budget Committee is undertaking a matter of grave concern.

I include in the RECORD letters from both the AFGE and the AFL-CIO with respect to the establishment of the so-called fiscal commission.

JANUARY 12, 2024.

AFGE APPLAUDS LAWMAKERS' CALL TO REJECT FISCAL COMMISSION

WASHINGTON—The American Federation of Government Employees is echoing calls from nearly 120 lawmakers for Congress to reject a proposed fiscal commission that would bypass elected leadership and make recommendations to slash vital federal programs and government services.

"A fiscal commission would give a small group of lawmakers and non-elected individuals enormous power to recommend cuts to Social Security and other popular programs without any ability for the public to weigh in," AFGE National President Everett Kelley said.

"If Congress is serious about preserving Social Security, Medicare, and similar programs for future generations, then it needs to have an honest discussion about how to do that—not pawn off these decisions to a secret group behind closed doors."

On Jan. 11, Reps. John Larson of Connecticut and Jan Schakowsky of Illinois sent a letter to House Speaker Mike Johnson and Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries signed by 116 members of the U.S. House calling on them to exclude a fiscal commission from legislation funding the federal government for the remainder of fiscal 2024 or any other must-pass bills.

"It is Congress's responsibility to conduct the oversight and recommend enhancements to solvency or cuts, and it should be done in the open and not behind closed doors," the letter states. "We do not need a Commission to tell us what we must do, we need the political courage to take up these or any other proposals in regular order."

Congress, for example, has yet to advance Rep. John Larson's Social Security 2100 Act, which would modernize Social Security, increase benefits, and safeguard the trust fund—all without raising taxes on middle income Americans or raising the retirement age. Congress still hasn't agreed on full-year funding for federal agencies, which have been operating under continuing resolutions since the fiscal year began Oct. 1.

"With just a week before government funding runs out for various departments including Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, HUD, and Transportation, Congress should focus on passing full-year funding for these and other government programs instead of trying to pawn off its tough decisions to an exclusive commission," Kelley said.

AFL-CIO,
LEGISLATIVE ALERT,

January 17, 2024.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I urge you to oppose the Fiscal Commission Act (H.R. 5779), the Debt-to-GDP Transparency and Stabilization Act (H.R. 6957), and the Fiscal State of the Nation Act (H.R. 6952), when they are considered by the House Budget Committee tomorrow. These bills would help set the stage for the kind of fiscal brinksmanship that demands cuts to workers' Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid benefits as the price of preventing government shutdowns. Instead of perpetuating this dysfunction, we believe Congress should commit to deliberating fiscal issues through the committees charged to examine these issues with transparency and an open process.

The AFL-CIO strongly opposes the Fiscal Commission Act. Under this bill, closed-door drafting of provisions to reduce federal deficits through program cuts and revenue changes would produce a bill that cannot be amended. Fast track procedures would require expedited floor consideration in the House and in the Senate without filibuster. The lack of transparency and accountability in such a process raises significant doubts about the intentions behind the approach, such as substantial benefit cuts in Social Security and other federal programs. We share The White House's characterization of this commission as a potential "death panel" for Social Security.

The Debt-to-GDP Transparency and Stabilization Act would establish a reporting mechanism that could be incorporated in a debt enforcement trigger for social benefit cuts in subsequent legislation. Such a debt trigger would come into play in times of recession when GDP contracts—exactly the worst time to implement benefit cuts on working families and slow the economy. Congress can acquire this data for its deliberations without establishing this mechanism, and we ask you to oppose this bill.

We also oppose the Fiscal State of the Nation Act in its current form. The bill would require an annual joint session of Congress to review reports of the government's assets and liabilities audited by the Government Accountability Office. We believe this annual session would be used to fan the flames of fiscal brinksmanship.

The recent history of fiscal commissions and super committees has shown that they

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H191

have failed to initiate salutary legislative efforts to reduce the deficit. Unfortunately, they were successful in paving the way for legislative efforts to cut federal worker's pay and benefits and in imposing budget caps that impacted appropriations for essential federal services. They did not lead to more equitable approaches to deficit reduction that balance program cuts with higher taxes for the wealthy.

We urge you to consider alternative legislation that can secure programs like Social Security and Medicare for the future while also improving affordability for seniors and working people. For instance, supporting legislation to extend Medicare's negotiation of lower drug prices for seniors and extending these savings to all working people. In addition, we encourage you to support Ranking Member Boyle's Medicare and Social Security Fair Share Act (H.R. 4535), which would ensure those earning more than \$400,000 pay their fair share in taxes to extend the sufficiency of the Social Security trust fund and Medicare.

In conclusion, I urge you to oppose the legislation that will be considered in tomorrow's mark up and to help advance the many bills already introduced that manage to simultaneously reduce the deficit and inequality.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important that Members understand what is being proposed and how it totally relies on no Member of this body other than the select few, Mr. Speaker, who will be chosen.

The commission is comprised of 16 individuals, 4 who are outside experts and not part of this body. The Senate will have six Members that they choose, three Republicans, three Democrats; the House three Democrats, three Republicans.

In a body of 435 people here, 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans will decide the future and fate of Social Security and Medicare. It is interesting. They will do so behind closed doors, with no obligation to report in public. Interestingly enough, too, the bill calls for them to form the committee, but they don't have to report back until after the election during a lameduck session.

Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. The committees of cognizance here that deal with these issues will have no relevance.

The only thing that will matter is an up-or-down vote decided by these individuals behind closed doors that is unamendable and comes to this floor for an up-or-down vote. This is outrageous, and it is wrong.

There are several remedies and proposals that exist out there for Social Security. This is what is so vitally important.

Close to 70 million Americans depend on Social Security, and Social Security doesn't create one penny of debt. It is a program that is fully paid for that cannot be borrowed from and has to be actuarially sound. Yet it is thrown in here by a desire by some to use a clandestine, subterranean, double-secret probation committee to cut benefits from Americans.

Adding insult to injury, the last time Congress enhanced the benefits for Social Security, Richard Nixon was President. That is more than 53 years ago now that Congress took some action to enhance benefits for people.

Mr. Speaker, 10,000 baby boomers per day become eligible for Social Security. More than 5 million of our fellow Americans get below-poverty-level checks, having worked all their lives and paid into the system.

What we need is a vote on Social Security. Put both measures side by side: a proposal to do a double-secret probation study committee versus actual legislation to improve and enhance Social Security for the more than 70 million Americans who will be participating.

Every single Member of Congress has Social Security recipients. We have sent you the exact number for your district. Imagine not having any increases in more than 53 years, for 40 percent of all Americans. In a Nation of more than 300 million people, for minimally 28 million Americans, this is the only thing they have for retirement. As everyone in this body knows, it is not just simply retirement. It is also spousal and dependent coverage. For military veterans especially, it is also for disability. This body has not done anything, nor the Senate, in 53 years.

All this study is, is kicking the can down the road and creating further problems. Oppose this legislation.

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF CHRISTINE HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service of one of our staffers on the VA Committee.

Ms. Christine Hill has dedicated decades of her career to this Nation's servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

She got her start in Congress as a military legislative assistant for Elizabeth Dole before being appointed and confirmed by the Senate to serve as the VA Assistant Secretary for congressional and legislative affairs in the Bush administration.

Christine then went on to advocate for veterans in the VSO world until we were able to bring her here to the committee where she has served as the Subcommittee on Health staff director for over 10 years.

Christine has helped advance dozens of bills supporting veterans and their families, most notably: giving veterans greater control over the healthcare that works for them through the Choice and the VA MISSION Acts, expanding mental health care and support through the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act, fighting for toxic-exposed veterans to get them the healthcare and benefits they have earned through the PACT Act, and so

many other landmark pieces of legislation.

It is important to note that she only began her impressive civilian career after a full 20-year career in the United States Air Force. Christine's entire life is marked by service, and she, without question, represents the best that America has to offer.

A graduate of the Air Force Academy, Christine held numerous positions as a KC-135 navigator, flying combat support during Desert Storm. Christine was handpicked to become the first woman assigned to fly the B-1B bomber and concluded her military career at the Pentagon, retiring as a lieutenant colonel.

You would never guess any of these things about Christine. She is one of the kindest, most humble people I have ever met, and she has been an absolute pleasure to work with during my time leading this committee. She is a dear friend of mine, and she will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Christine. I want her to have a wonderful life in the things she pursues from here on out. This Nation thanks her for the job she has done both in the military and for this institution.

COMMEMORATING 103 DAYS SINCE THE OCTOBER 7 ATTACK BY HAMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last night, I joined Members on both sides of the aisle for a candlelight vigil to mark 103 days since October 7; 103 days since Hamas tore through Israeli communities leaving slaughter, rape, and destruction in their wake; 103 days since these terrorists took hundreds of Israelis and Americans hostage; and sadly, Mr. Speaker, 103 days of inaction by this Congress.

I believe the sentiments and prayers our Members shared at the vigil are genuine. Indeed, the vast majority of this Congress wants to aid Israel as well as Ukraine, but our actions—rather, I should say, inaction—believe our words.

The far right has prevented this Congress from delivering the resources necessary to give our rhetoric meaning and impact. Hollow words, empty threats, and unfulfilled promises are poor substitutes for military hardware, munitions, and humanitarian relief.

From partisan IRS cuts to a complete overhaul of our immigration system, Republican leadership has made supplemental aid to our allies contingent on completely unrelated issues.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the Speaker of this House, Mr. JOHNSON, sponsored a bill just a few years ago that said only one subject per bill because he didn't want to be forced to vote for something that he liked at the same time he voted for something he didn't like. From partisan IRS cuts to

immigration, the effort to unnecessarily complicate this aid is ironic considering that bill was called the One Subject at a Time Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is one subject that ought to be at the top of our minds right now: the defense of democracy. Every moment we fail to act disheartens our allies and emboldens the enemies of freedom.

Hamas doesn't have to question its allies' commitment to their cause. The Houthis have made their devotion clear, as have Iran, Hezbollah, and other Iranian proxies.

Putin knows he has the backing of the new axis of evil, as well. North Korea supplies him with artillery shells and ballistic missiles that rain down on Ukrainian civilians. Iran sends him suicide drones that buzz over trenches and through city streets across Ukraine.

Iran gives those same weapons to Hamas and its other proxies to use against the people of Israel.

We, on the other hand, are sowing doubt daily for our allies and for our enemies.

At least 132 Israeli and American hostages remain in Gaza awaiting rescue. Innocent Palestinians await our humanitarian aid as Hamas continues to use them as human shields.

In Ukraine, our allies scavenge the husks of burnt-out Russian tanks for spare parts. Ukrainian commanders are forced to ration ammunition. Artillery crews wait days for resupply, and when it finally comes, they can often count the number of shells on one hand.

Has the wellspring of freedom run dry? We must answer them now. Our answer must be a resounding no. Our actions now will be our only reply that is heard. The strong words of yesterday will be drowned out by the thunder of inaction today.

America, a beacon of freedom and democracy, stands inactive in the light of Putin's criminal aggression and Hamas' terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, let us come together and let us act. There are over 300 votes in this House for Ukraine. There are over 400 votes in this House for Israel and for humanitarian relief. Let us not stand silent, inept, inactive, unable to help those who are on freedom's front line this very hour.

□ 1015

PERRY STRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, just 2 weeks after the horrific violence that ripped through the small town of Perry, Iowa.

On the morning of Thursday, January 4, students woke up and returned to school after their winter break. They did not know what that day would entail. Before school had started, some students arrived for a break-

fast program just before 8:00 a.m., and reports of shots rang throughout the school. Law enforcement rushed to Perry High School.

The violence that day left four students wounded, the death of sixth grader Ahmir Jolliff, and now, most recently, the life of Perry High School Principal Dan Marburger. The Butler family also lost their son that day.

Like many Iowans, when I first heard the news, I was angry. No parent, no child, no teacher should ever have to wonder if it is safe to be able to go to school. We have a duty, a sacred oath, to protect our children, our families, and our educators.

In addition, no family and no parent should ever have to feel the pain that Ahmir's mother, Erica, felt that day when she learned that her 11-year-old son, Mr. Smiley, had been shot and killed simply for going to school.

Ahmir was an incredible kid. His mother shares that he loved soccer, played the tuba, and sang in a choir. Most importantly, that day, he got up excited to go back to school because he wanted to see his friends and his teachers.

This past weekend, this horrible attack claimed another life, Principal Dan Marburger. The multiple injuries Dan sustained were a result of his truly heroic effort to save his students. Dan was a loving father, a grandfather, a husband, a son, and a great educator.

He worked in the Perry School District since 1995, but when Dan heard the danger happening in his school, when others fled, when he could have run to save his immediate staff, he swarmed toward the danger, and there is no doubt that his actions saved lives.

Perhaps no one could share the story of Principal Marburger better than his own daughter, Claire, who said: As many of you know, Dad is a gentle giant, an amazing dad, just an amazing person. When I heard of a gunman, I instantly had a feeling my dad would be a victim, as he would put himself in harm's way for the benefit of kids and his staff. It is absolutely zero surprise to hear that he tried to approach and talk Dylan down and distract him long enough for some students to get out of the cafeteria, because that is just Dad.

There is no doubt he saved many lives through his selfless action. His legacy will live on through many students that he both mentored and educated, and his sacrifice will never be forgotten—not in Iowa, not in America.

Today, while our hearts mourn over this tragedy, we will be there for our community.

In the evening and days that followed the violence, we heard of students who helped each other get to safety. We learned the story of a kind stranger who drove an injured student, fleeing from the school riddled with bullets, to a hospital to help get treatment.

Going forward, we learned of law enforcement who were able to be on the scene within minutes, helping to protect even more students and securing

the school quickly. We learned of doctors, nurses, medical professionals, and an incredible Life Flight crew who landed on the Perry High School football field to shuttle those casualties and those wounded to trauma centers across the State from this rural community. We learned of all who worked tirelessly to help those who were injured. We also heard the stories of vigils and community gatherings in the days that followed the shooting.

As we continue to move forward, now is the time for healing, a time to ensure that our communities are safe, our kids feel confident to return to class, and that families and educators know that Iowa has their backs.

We all have a responsibility to ensure safety for our students, and that begins with mental health, preventing youth suicide, hardening our schools, and ensuring our law enforcement and our schools are prepared to respond when these violent acts occur. Together, we have led on this, but there is more work to be done.

From this tragedy, there are lessons learned. These lifesaving actions that took place at Perry High School must be shared across the country, and I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in learning from this horrible event so that we can save lives into the future.

Mr. Speaker, these are hard days ahead of us, and much work remains to be done, but we will get through this together, because, today, we are all Perry strong.

DIABETIC SHOES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as I face the last 50 weeks as a Member of this Congress, I am appalled at the amount of time we waste on performances on things that will never become law, that shouldn't become law, and, in fact, the American public doesn't care that much about.

However, yesterday, the front page of The New York Times was something that people should care about, talking about the problem of diabetes and the complications that can lead to amputations, especially among men.

It is no secret we are facing an epidemic of diabetes. Nearly 15 percent of American adults, more than 38 million people, have diabetes, and it is even worse among Americans 65 years or older, with a rate of nearly 30 percent. It is the eighth leading cause of death in the United States.

Right now, we are marking up a commission to deal with the budget deficit in our Budget Committee. The direct and indirect costs of diabetes alone in 2022 were \$413 billion, and the extra costs for a diabetes patient were more than \$12,000 per patient.

We should make improvements in delivery that prevent the disease and the progression, not only for the health of

the patient but also for our healthcare system.

Type 2 diabetes is a huge factor dealing with modern diet and our health habits. These factors, combined with genetics and limited access to healthcare, can make it a challenge to control blood sugar levels and contribute to the progression of the disease. It can result in serious, life-threatening consequences on relatively minor events.

People can have a problem with their foot. It starts small with some nerve damage and maybe a foot ulcer, but it explodes, if untreated, to more intense conditions like gangrene and requires amputation to save the life of the patient.

Nearly half of diabetes patients develop this nerve damage, and many go on to develop the foot ulcers I referenced. It is worse for people of color. African Americans are two to three times more likely to need an amputation.

When we know that millions of Americans suffer from diabetes and face dire complications, why wouldn't we take the opportunity to do everything in our power to limit the progression of the disease? There are, in fact, low-cost solutions that can remedy the situation.

One that I have been working on for several years is a simple treatment of diabetic shoes, which deal with the foot conditions that are such a problem for people with diabetes, that can help prevent the problems that lead to those amputations.

Unfortunately, diabetic shoes require a prescription from a doctor. I mean, it is not rocket science. It could be done by a nurse practitioner or by a physician assistant, but we don't allow that. It is also an extra barrier for people who have problems navigating the healthcare system; they might give up or ignore it. It results in extra cost and extra time.

These delays can have profound consequences, as I mentioned. It is not a barrier for people with private insurance; if they needed these shoes when they were at 64, it wouldn't be a problem.

Congressman LAHOOD and I have a simple legislative fix to address this unnecessary quirk in our healthcare system. It would allow nurse practitioners and physicians assistants to satisfy the documentation requirements, at no extra cost to the patient, no extra delays, and do it directly. You shouldn't need a doctor to prescribe these shoes.

This is just one of dozens of examples of commonsense, bipartisan reforms that will reduce spending, improve outcomes, and, in fact, save lives and limbs. I hope we can focus on simple, commonsense things like this that are bipartisan in nature that aren't expensive and that make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to save a life and save a limb.

TRIBUTE TO MADISON MARSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the new Miss America, Madison Marsh; that is, Second Lieutenant Madison Marsh of Fort Smith, Arkansas, crowned Miss America 2024 in ceremonies in Orlando, Florida, last Sunday.

Now, for the record, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that she competed under the title of Miss Colorado, having been a cadet at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

This amazing young lady graduated from Fort Smith Southside High School in 2019, and it was in the foyer of her high school where I first became acquainted with her. She met with me to discuss the possibility of her attending the Air Force Academy. After a brief discussion, it became clear to me that she had all the attributes we look for in future military officers, and she earned the designation as my principal nominee to the academy that year. Soon thereafter, the academy brass agreed with my nomination and gave her an appointment.

In her 4 years at the academy, Lieutenant Marsh excelled at everything, and she graduated and received her commission in the Air Force in June of 2023.

Just prior to graduation, however, she won the title of Miss Colorado and earned a trip to the Miss America Pageant, where she became the first military officer in the history of the pageant to compete for the title of Miss America. Then, on Sunday, last Sunday, just before 10 o'clock eastern time, she was crowned Miss America.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to put into words how proud I am of this young lady. In this job, I have the opportunity to work with a lot of very special people. She is certainly one of them.

Few people have the blend of intellect, talent, poise, fitness, and beauty as Madison Marsh—an astrophysics major, selected for pilot training, Truman Scholar, Rhodes finalist. Accepted into Harvard Kennedy School, she is well on her way to her advanced degree in this prestigious university—now, Miss America.

All of that is impressive, for sure, but one of the most redeeming qualities of this young lady is her passion for finding the cure for pancreatic cancer, a cause she has taken up due to the untimely death of her mother, Whitney, at age 41. That led to the founding of the Whitney Marsh Foundation, purposed in raising awareness and funding for pancreatic cancer research.

This new platform will give rise to an increased awareness of this dreadful disease, and Lieutenant Marsh is the perfect spokesperson.

I have had the privilege of being associated with three Miss Americas: Elizabeth Ward from my hometown of Russellville, Arkansas in 1982; Savvy

Shields, Miss America 2016 from Fayetteville, Arkansas; and now, the reigning Miss America, Madison Marsh.

What an honor, Mr. Speaker, to have played a small role in this young lady's success. We join her family, her father, Mike; sisters Heidi and Sarah; brothers Nick and Chris; and her extended family in congratulating Madison Marsh for this terrific honor.

I know Whitney, who is looking down from Heaven, is enormously proud of her daughter for what she has become. Now, the rest of America knows.

□ 1030

DTE WINTER OUTAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, DTE Energy, an investor-owned utility monopoly in southeast Michigan, charges some of the highest rates in our Nation but provides some of the most unreliable service. They also carry out hundreds of thousands of cruel utility shutoffs per year.

Over 100,000 DTE customers in southeast Michigan were forced to go days without power and heat during extreme cold and hot weather. This is because, instead of investing in reliability, DTE invests in profits and pays their shareholders and executives first. DTE's own CEO makes \$10 million a year while families in southeast Michigan are going without power, again, during some of the coldest days this past week.

Investor-owned utilities like DTE have failed to invest in the infrastructure upgrades to the grid that are necessary to prevent these outages. Instead, they are choosing to maximize profits for their shareholders while spending millions on campaign contributions to avoid real accountability in Lansing.

My residents are sick and tired of wealthy corporate executives lining their pockets while our neighbors are exploited and price gouged. That is why I am proud to have introduced a resolution with Congresswoman CORI BUSH and Congressman JAMAAL BOWMAN. It is a resolution recognizing the human right to utilities.

It is important that we understand that access to utilities is not a privilege. It is a fundamental human right. In the richest country on Earth, every single family should not go without electricity, heat, and water.

We need utilities that serve the people, not shareholders. We need to take the profit motive out of the services we all need to live and thrive.

YEMEN STRIKES

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I stand in solidarity with the billions of people all around the world who are demanding a cease-fire now.

The majority of Americans support de-escalation and a lasting cease-fire, yet the President has threatened to escalate this into a regional war instead

of doing anything to stop Netanyahu's genocidal bombing campaign.

Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank are being murdered by American weapons funded by our tax dollars. Lebanese national civilians are being killed, and now the Yemeni people are under threat.

Prior to the Israeli Government's assault on Gaza, Yemen was facing the worst humanitarian crisis on Earth, with much of the population living on the brink of famine.

President Biden was legally required to seek authorization from Congress prior to launching these strikes. He did not do so and, as a result, has violated the United States Constitution. This is completely unacceptable.

Many of my colleagues have correctly called out the Biden administration for bypassing Congress. The American people do not want to be dragged into yet another endless war in the Middle East.

ZETA PHI BETA SORORITY FOUNDERS' DAY

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with immense pride and joy in recognizing and celebrating the Founders' Day of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated.

This marks a time of reflection, appreciation, and unity for a sisterhood committed to the service of others.

Zeta Phi Beta was founded on the principles of scholarship, service, sisterhood, and finer womanhood. This sisterhood has fostered academic excellence and empowerment in our communities. From educational initiatives to advocating for social justice, Zeta Phi Beta has been a force for good.

We continue to honor the vision of our founders: Arizona Cleaver Stemmons, Pearl Anna Neal, Myrtle Tyler Faithful, and Viola Tyler Goings.

Happy Founders' Day to my sorors of Zeta Phi Beta. I am so proud to be a part of the sisterhood. To all of the January D9 family, happy Founders' Day. May their commitment to excellence and service continue to inspire us all.

BORDER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLOUD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the ongoing crisis at the southern border, President Biden's failure of leadership, and the dire need to fix this crisis now.

Every year, I hold a townhall in each of the 60 counties in the Big First District. I just finished townhall 22 for this year, and at each of those townhalls, Kansans have brought up the border crisis as one of the top issues on their minds. I share their outrage. The crisis at our southern border is unnecessary, and President Biden has only escalated it.

Since President Biden took office, there have been more than 7 million illegal encounters at our southern bor-

der. There have been 2 million known got-aways. These are just the people whom we know about who avoided apprehension and entered our country illegally. That is nearly 13 congressional districts and is over three times the population of the State of Kansas.

There have been 312 suspects on the terrorist watch list apprehended trying to cross our southern border. No one knows how many terrorists actually made it into our country.

Meanwhile, crime is spiking; our brave Border Patrol agents are overwhelmed; and lethal drugs like fentanyl are pouring into this country, wreaking havoc on our families and killing Americans.

The word is out all over the world: President Biden hasn't just created a porous southern border. He has created a wide-open border with a welcome mat, and he has done so with disregard for law and order.

I have been to the southern border. I saw human heartbreak, scared children, overcrowded facilities, and evidence of crimes committed by Mexican cartels, which are making \$13 billion a year smuggling people and drugs into our country.

I also saw giant sections of the unfinished border wall with the materials to finish those sections literally sitting there, lying in piles in the sun.

Fixing the border crisis isn't rocket science. It would just take a few commonsense steps.

House Republicans have done our job. Eight months ago, we passed H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act. That legislation required the Biden administration to restart construction of the southern border wall, deploy state-of-the-art technology to strengthen the border security system, ensure transparency from the Department of Homeland Security regarding illegal crossings, and increase the number of Border Patrol agents.

The Secure the Border Act would also strengthen existing laws to protect children from human trafficking, terminate catch and release, end the abuse of executive immigration authority, and make critical reforms to streamline the asylum process.

Those are commonsense steps to fix the border crisis. It is time for the U.S. Senate and President Biden to act.

President Biden needs to fix this crisis now. He needs to end catch and release, stop the abuse of the asylum system, finish the wall, invest in more Border Patrol agents, and reinstate the remain in Mexico policy.

It is estimated that if President Biden would just reinstate the remain in Mexico policy, which he inherited on day one of his Presidency and which was working until he reversed it, then it could reduce the flow of migrants to the border by up to 70 percent.

Again, the legislation to do all of this has already passed in the House. President Biden could end this crisis today if he wanted to.

Migrant encounters at the southern border hit a new record last month at

302,000, with 12,600 on December 18, which was a single-day record. If that doesn't wake up the administration to reality, then I am not sure what will. Let's fix the problem at our southern border and secure our country now.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, when the child tax credit was originally expanded by the American Rescue Plan in 2021, it provided a lifeline to families during very serious economic hardship.

The benefit allowed families to receive an extra \$3,600 annually for kids under the age of 6 years old and \$3,000 annually for children over 6 years of age. In my district, the child tax credit provided \$185 million to 123,000 children and 47,000 families.

The expansion lifted 13,700 children in my district out of poverty. It is a district with a median household income of \$48,638 and where emergency room visits for children with asthma are 20 times higher in the Bronx than any other borough. An average of 28 percent of residents are paying 50 percent or more of their income in rent. It is a district where about 84 percent of the 475,000 households earn below the poverty level and have a severe rent burden.

Mr. Speaker, students in the school districts that I represent receive some of the highest rates of title I funding in the city.

I am heartened to hear of the negotiations that will include an expanded child tax credit for low-income families. However, the agreement fails to make the full child tax credit available as a refund to families with little or no taxable income. I don't get this. All of a sudden, this is leaving the neediest families, the lowest earning families, out of the benefit. They will receive no child tax credit.

The objectors to this are the same folks who share this floor and, time after time, refer to the Bible. They say that the Bible states that we must feed the hungry. They say that the Bible states that we must shelter the homeless. They say that the Bible says that we must provide clothing to those who are needy. They say that the Bible says that we must welcome strangers.

Mr. Speaker, the same Holy Book that they refer to year after year says that we must welcome strangers. Now, I can share with you that it says, for example, in Matthew: "For I was hungry and you gave Me food, I was thirsty and you gave Me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed Me."

Yet, these folks oppose helping the neediest, and they go back home every week to their districts and rely on the Holy Book that says completely the opposite.

We just heard it right here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Under the framework, again, the lowest earning families will receive no child tax credit. It is crucial that the tax framework be improved to ensure that substantial tax cuts to working-class families are there and that they receive that benefit just as we did back in 2021.

The naysayers are either with the Holy Book or not. The naysayers cannot continue to oppose the neediest. We have to provide this help to America's neediest families. It is at the very center of who we are as a country.

Let's welcome the strangers. The economy needs them. Historically, we have not been able to move forward without the help of them. Every chapter of our history that has seen a major transformation in our economy has seen the presence of strangers. Let's give them the help that they need.

DENOUNCING BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDER POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, President Biden and the Biden administration have surrendered the southern border, and the policies of this administration continue to make worse a national security crisis, a public safety crisis, and a humanitarian crisis of epic proportions.

Earlier this month, I joined my colleagues visiting, again, the southern border and saw firsthand that despite the heroic work of Border Patrol officers and despite every effort of the men and women serving in this Nation, we have seen a total collapse in our border security system.

There is unfettered fentanyl trafficking, a record 7 million illegal crossings, and strained communities and law enforcement throughout our Southern States.

This crisis, though, isn't isolated only to border States. In fact, because of the failure of this administration, every State is a border State. Because of the decisions made by mayors like the one in New York City, communities like ours continue to face growing challenges and a growing crisis.

The communities I represent are strained to provide services to those who are homeless and housing insecure, those who are hungry and need help, and those who struggle with mental health and substance use disorder.

Yet, the President and the Governor of the State of New York continue to allow Mayor Eric Adams to circumvent the law and transport human souls to communities in upstate New York.

Deadly drug trafficking continues, with fentanyl and synthetic opioids pouring into our country and into communities, taking countless American lives.

We have a means to end this crisis. The President has the tools and resources at his disposal today to con-

front the crisis in a way that recognizes a concern for national security and in a way that is compassionate. He chooses not to.

The House has adopted H.R. 2, which would strengthen border security, enhance the asylum-seeking vetting process, and support and care for unaccompanied minors. Yet, we see no progress from the Senate or the President in embracing those policies.

There is a solution to securing our border, and we must act now. The President needs to not only acknowledge the problem but work in a bipartisan fashion to recognize the tools at his disposal and to secure our border.

□ 1045

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SENIOR SERGEANT CHRISTOPHER FILLI OF THE HUDSON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Senior Sergeant Christopher Filli of the Hudson City Police Department in Columbia County in upstate New York and acknowledging with a heavy heart the untimely passing of a man who embodied the essence of community, duty, and passion.

I know his family and knew Chris to be a devoted husband, father, and son. He left us on January 12, 2024, while faithfully serving the community he loved.

His journey began on January 19, 1973, and over the course of 22 years, he demonstrated exceptional commitment and selfless service to the Hudson City Police Department and the Hudson community.

From his early days with the Copake and Philmont Police Departments to his final role as senior sergeant, Chris' dedication was unwavering. He not only protected the city of Hudson, but also found joy in a second career as the owner of Chris Filli & Son Tree Service, Incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, we will always remember Chris for being a family man, cherishing every moment spent with his wife, Megan, and their children, creating a legacy of love and great devotion. We are heartbroken but stand united in honoring Chris' memory. May he rest in peace, and may his legacy of dedication to his community and his family live on in our hearts.

PROTECTING HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN ACROSS OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today ahead of the 51st anniversary of Roe v. Wade to urge my colleagues to take action to protect reproductive freedom, which has been under assault since the United States Supreme Court overturned Roe in the 2022 Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization.

I was 1 month old when the Roe decision came down, and I had peace of

mind when entering my childbearing years that any decision on when to become a mother would be mine, and that any pregnancy-related decisions that I had to make would be between me, my partner, and my medical provider.

Thirteen years ago, I became the first member of the Virginia House of Delegates to be pregnant while in office. As a Black woman in a Nation grappling with a maternal and infant health crisis, I researched everything that could go right and everything that could wrong.

The conversations with my OB opened my eyes to the impact that abortion restrictions can have on pregnancy management decisions, and my doctor shared stories.

My doctor shared stories like Suzie, a married 30-something with a hole in her heart who was on birth control but got pregnant anyway; or Beth, a pregnant woman who developed cancer.

Each faced a heartbreaking choice of whether to terminate the pregnancy or sacrifice her life.

There was Mary, who underwent fertility treatments to have a child and got pregnant with octuplets. The odds of carrying the pregnancy were very low, but if she reduced the pregnancy to two, the odds were better than 50/50 that both would survive.

There was Amy, who suffered an incomplete or missed miscarriage in which the fetus dies but remains in the uterus. Often a medical procedure, an abortion, is required to remove the fetus and the placenta to avoid infection, sepsis, and death.

There was Robin, whose fetus developed the most severe form of spina bifida, with horrific deformities. Her doctor suspected that the baby was already paralyzed from the waist down, and that the paralysis would spread as he grew. He was not expected to survive.

I heard story after story, and I thought about how the abortion restrictions that I saw proposed then in Virginia and across the country would have taken away decisions on the best course of treatment for those patients.

In today's post-Dobbs world, we are witnessing the devastating impacts of restrictive abortion laws on mothers and families across the United States right now.

This anniversary of Roe is an important reminder that we must continue fighting to ensure that every American has access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare, and that we do not insert the judgment of politicians in State legislatures or here in Washington for those of the healthcare providers' and patients' judgment.

During my second pregnancy, I had placenta previa. I was aware of the risks associated with it, but that didn't stop me from being terrified when, 9 weeks before my due date, my placenta ruptured. I was rushed into the hospital and had an emergency C-section.

Both my daughter and I nearly died.

It was one of the scariest days of my life. However, I had peace of mind

knowing that my doctor in that moment would make the decision she felt best to provide the treatment necessary based on the standard of care without fear of punishment from politicians if things went wrong.

Thankfully, that delivery was successful and many of you have come to know my daughter, Samantha, as a thriving, precocious, healthy little girl.

However, when she reaches child-bearing years, will she have fewer rights than I did when I gave birth to her?

That very thought makes me furious. It makes me livid that I am the first member of my family to lose a constitutional right in my lifetime. That reality has motivated me more than ever to protect reproductive freedom just as I did as a State legislator, passing legislation that makes Virginia the only State in the South without an abortion ban or extreme restrictions post-Dobbs.

I will continue to fight for reproductive freedom for patients and providers to make the choice they believe is best given their necessary circumstances without interference from Washington or State legislatures.

CRISIS UNFOLDING AT SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the crisis unfolding at the southern border, a crisis that has been grossly neglected by the Biden administration.

Let's be clear: Texas is stepping up to the plate, because under President Joe Biden's failed leadership, the Federal Government has abdicated its responsibilities.

Under the Constitution, it is the Federal Government's job to secure our borders. If the Biden administration did its duty, Texas law enforcement officials could focus on local issues, not Federal issues. However, President Biden won't even acknowledge the crisis at our doorstep, and that is why Texas is leading the charge on border security.

This was entirely avoidable. How do we know this? Due to President Biden's decision to roll back effective border security policies it has sparked an unprecedented increase in illegal immigration, leaving Texas in the untenable position of having to manage this crisis.

The Biden administration's current lawsuit against Texas underscores its own failures.

In south Texas, we are on the front lines of this crisis, witnessing the chaos and the strain that illegal crossings are causing to local communities. This isn't just a policy failure; it represents a clear and present danger to our local communities, to extremely vulnerable immigrants, and really to all Americans.

Let me also address some of the other nonsense we are hearing from the other side.

My name is MONICA DE LA CRUZ. I am the granddaughter of Mexican "campesinos," "farmers," and I am from Hidalgo County, which is over 90 percent Hispanic. In fact, no one would ever confuse my children or me as anything other than Hispanic. We are very proud of our Latino heritage, so this entire notion that concerns over border security are somehow anti-immigrant or racist is itself racist.

The bigotry of low expectations that assumes that just because we are Hispanic, we do not care about this country's laws, and that we do not care about having safe and secure borders is simply not true. In fact, it is just ignorant.

Mark my words, the Biden White House's refusal to address this crisis and its insistence on labeling those who are concerned with border security as racist will cost this administration dearly.

We do not like this mess. Guess what? It affects our neighborhoods, our bodegas, our kids' schools. They are all on the front lines of this crisis, along with those of the millions of other patriotic Americans.

We are sick and tired of weak border policies being misrepresented as compassionate. No, Mr. Speaker. True compassion is enforcing our country's immigration laws, requiring people to come here legally and safely, and protecting Americans from the dangers posed by weak borders.

As a Congresswoman, I refuse to stand idly by. The situation we are facing is detrimental and it is inhumane, not only to Texans, but also to the American people and those who are being exploited by the coyotes and the cartels.

This crisis demands immediate and effective Federal attention, which we have yet to see under the Biden administration.

WE NEED TO FIX OUR OUTDATED, BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today about a place that I love, and a place that is vitally important to our Nation.

I am a proud product of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, a culturally rich binational community, full of opportunity, which helps power international trade and is key to bringing down the costs of goods for all Americans.

I understand how disillusioned Americans have become when it comes to addressing our broken immigration system and the challenges that we currently face at the border.

I am frustrated myself. That is why I stand here today saying that both

Democrats and Republicans have not done enough to fix our outdated, broken immigration system. The administration should look to the leadership and the experience of border House Representatives, like myself, on immigration reform and border security.

Let me be clear: Republicans haven't brought forward any real bipartisan solutions that could help alleviate the impacts of the humanitarian crisis that we are seeing today.

In fact, just this week, Republicans introduced a toothless resolution that only serves as a political statement that vilifies immigrants.

Further, Republicans did this in the same week that extreme rightwing immigration policies in the State of Texas led to the death of two migrant children who drowned in the Rio Grande. This is disgraceful. It is not who we are. It is un-American.

Trust me, I am tired of Congress kicking this can down the road for over 30 years. That is why I have introduced a package of commonsense legislation that could help solve this problem.

We can fix this crisis, but we can't do it while we lose our humanity. We can do that by securing our border, while also ensuring immigrants are treated humanely. After all, we are a Nation of immigrants.

That means investing in customs agents who work long hours and providing them with the tools they need to do their jobs. It means modernizing our legal system to match our needs. It means giving new Americans the opportunity to fill the jobs that our Nation and our communities desperately need.

I am a proud Democrat, but I am an American first, and right now that means holding everybody accountable to bring real solutions to the American people.

□ 1100

SCHOOL CHOICE EMPOWERS FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. STEEL). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, Monday marks the beginning of National School Choice Week, a time to celebrate and explore the various education options available to students and parents.

Education is the cornerstone of opportunity in America, and we must spare no effort in laying the foundation for our students to prosper. Educational freedom is essential in these efforts and begets success for America's children while offering parents the resources to support their child's future.

No two students are the same, but that is the strength of school choice: empowering students and their families to select the environment that best supports their individual goals and specific needs.

Rather than assigning students to schools based solely on their ZIP Code, school choice places students and parents back where they belong, at the helm of decisionmaking concerning education.

Options like innovative charter schools, magnet schools, homeschooling, and scholarship programs personalize education and have revived new hope and opportunities for countless American families.

I would like to take a moment to commend and reflect on the progress achieved by the school choice movement in the last year. 2023 was a monumental year for expanding school choice across the country. A record 20 States implemented programs or legislation to make education alternatives available for millions of students.

Through these initiatives, these States have reasserted the rights of American parents to play a central role in selecting and pursuing the education model they believe suits their child.

I am proud to highlight that my home State of North Carolina was among these pioneer States and became the ninth State to pass universal school choice legislation. North Carolina and the 19 other States that passed legislation are amazing examples of putting students first.

However, too many of our Nation's students are kept from realizing their full potential because they do not have access to a high-quality education. The uncomfortable truth is that the one-size-fits-all approach to education is harming our students.

America invests over \$800 billion into education, yet the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress found that reading scores declined to their lowest level since 1992, and math scores saw their largest decline since the initial 1990 assessment.

On the other hand, education choice has been proven to improve student achievement, attainment, and even character development.

We must fund students, not systems.

School choice puts education funding directly into the hands of parents. By allowing parents the discretion to use the funds already allocated for their child's education as they see fit, school choice ensures that students and schools are well matched and taxpayer dollars are used responsibly for programs and institutions that produce the best outcomes for students.

We were sent to Congress to represent the will of the American people, and 71 percent of Americans support school choice, according to recent polling.

I am proud of the advancements made for the parents who now have the rightful say in their child's education and for the students who can now unlock their full capabilities regardless of their financial situation, home address, or learning needs.

The next challenge we face is extending the promise of school choice to all 50 States. As Chairwoman of the Edu-

cation and the Workforce Committee, I am committed to promoting high-quality education for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I wish everyone a happy National School Choice Week, and I look forward to celebrating more progress and milestones in 2024.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SONNY ADKINS, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a truly great American, Mr. Sonny Adkins, Jr., who passed away on November 26, 2023.

Sonny was born in York County, South Carolina, and was the husband of the late Billie Jones Adkins, who was truly the love of his life.

In the early 1960s, Sonny started a business with his first sidekicks, as he called them, Billie Adkins and Sam Robinson. The name of his company was Adkins Oil Burner Service, later to become Adkins Heating & Cooling. Sonny ran his business every day focused on the care and love of his customers and built great relationships with all of the wonderful customers that he served.

Sonny ended up raising his own workers, as his children grew up and became the Adkins' employees. Sonny said many times, "I raised my own workers the way I wanted them to be." Each struggle he faced was a lesson to the family on how to live a full life.

In his recent days, he spent time riding his hay fields on a mule planning for the next hay season in his head. His planning included detailed instructions for the farmhands, also his family and friends, on what was needed to be done, and, more importantly, how to do it right, which was Sonny's way.

Sonny wore many hats. He was a God-loving man, a great teacher to his family, the land developer of Carrollton Place, and a farmer. However, the most important roles that he filled were being a wonderful son, brother, husband, father, uncle, paw paw, and friend.

At his funeral, there was a poem that was read that I think was so fitting for the life of Sonny Adkins. It goes like this:

Do not stand at my grave and weep.
I am not there; I do not sleep.
I am a thousand winds that blow;
I am the diamond glints on snow;
I am the sunlight on ripened grain;
I am the gentle autumn's rain.
Do not stand at my grave and mourn.
I am the dew-flecked grass at dawn.
When tranquil oceans meet the land
I am the footprints in the sand
To guide you through the weary day.
I am still here; I'll always stay.
When you wake up to morning's hush
I am the swift uplifting rush
Of quiet birds in circled flight.
I am the stars that shine at night.
Do not stand at my grave and cry.
I am not there; I did not die.

Many funerals we go to, the sermon doesn't match the man, but with

Sonny Adkins, the words definitely matched the man, and what a tribute to a life well lived.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF ST. AUGUSTINE ART ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the St. Augustine Art Association's 100th birthday.

Founded on January 18, 1924, 100 years ago today, the St. Augustine Art Association has now become the 13th oldest continually operating art association here in the United States.

The association plays an integral role in preserving and promoting the artistic heritage of St. Augustine, Florida, the oldest continuously inhabited European settlement in the continental United States and has been described as the epicenter of the local arts community.

The St. Augustine Art Association Art Center is open year round and is free to the public, welcoming over 10,000 visitors annually. The gallery hosts exhibitions, concerts, workshops, classes, lectures, and artwork from more than a thousand different artists of all backgrounds.

Thanks to the art center's involvement, these contemporary artists are able to keep St. Augustine's present day art colony alive and thriving.

The St. Augustine Art Association also provides outreach programs that serve several groups within the community, including the blind, local public school students, elder groups, and community businesses. These groups are all given access to the association's user-friendly gallery there in the heart of St. Augustine.

On behalf of Florida's Fifth Congressional District, I am proud to recognize the St. Augustine Art Association for its contributions to our community's local culture, history, and community. We wish them a happy 100th birthday.

RENAMING VA CLINIC IN HONOR OF ELWIN SHOPTEESE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of renaming the VA outpatient clinic in Kansas City, Kansas, after Captain Elwin "Al" Shopteese.

Captain Shopteese was born and raised in Mayetta, Kansas, and was a member of the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation. Upon graduating high school, he enlisted in the Kansas National Guard and served as part of Company E, 137th Infantry Regiment.

He deployed to Europe during World War II and fought in both the invasion of Normandy and the Battle of the Bulge. Captain Shopteese received the

Bronze Star and Purple Heart for his service and selfless sacrifice to our Nation.

After returning to Kansas following the Korean war, Captain Shopteese served as a Tribal council member of the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation and helped create the Indian Community Alcoholism Resources Expeditors Recovery Home.

Captain Shopteese's profound legacy of service to our country and to the Native American community will live on for generations to come. I am proud to join my fellow Kansans in introducing legislation to rename the clinic after this American hero and a member of the Greatest Generation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KEN BROCK

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Ken Brock, a dear friend of mine and a pillar in the southeast Kansas community.

Ken graduated from Fort Scott High School and served in the Kansas Army National Guard before founding Names and Numbers, a business that published easy-to-use local phone books. Ken grew Names and Numbers with his wife, Debbie, into one of the leading independent directory companies in the country.

In addition to being a successful entrepreneur and major job creator, Ken was passionate about strengthening our communities and bringing new economic development to the region. He served as the chairman of the Highway 69 Association and successfully led the charge to expand Highway 69 to a four-lane route from Kansas City to Pittsburg. Ken was also active on the Pittsburg State University campus, serving on numerous boards and advisory committees.

Growing up in southeast Kansas, I know firsthand the profound impact Ken had on our region. Ken was a joyful person, a dedicated person, always putting his family, community, and country ahead of himself. He is someone you would have wanted on your side, and I was glad that he was on mine.

It has been an honor to get to know him and his family over the years, and I am grateful for all that he has done. Ken Brock passed away this past December, but his legacy of faith, family, and community will not be forgotten.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SENATOR BOB MARSHALL

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of State Senator Bob Marshall, who passed away this past September.

Bob Marshall attended the University of Kansas, where he became a four-sport letterman and played basketball alongside the legendary Wilt Chamberlain. He was a tremendous athlete and a tremendous competitor, something I learned firsthand.

Upon graduating KU, Senator Marshall was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps and flew vital reconnaissance missions dur-

ing the Cuban Missile Crisis. He left active duty in 1965 and became a commercial airline pilot for the next 33 years before switching gears and taking on the role as athletic director at Fort Scott Community College.

Bob was elected to the Kansas State Senate in 2009, where he served on the transportation, economic development, education, and local government committees, securing crucial funding for universities across our State.

Senator Marshall worked tirelessly to strengthen our communities and serve hardworking Kansas families. I am honored to have the opportunity to have gotten to know him. He will be greatly missed in Kansas.

CONGRATULATING RANDY LINCK ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate senior investigator Randy Linck on his retirement from the Brown County Sheriff's Office.

Randy dedicated more than four decades to protecting Kansas families in the Brown County community, making him the longest serving law enforcement officer in county history. He started his law enforcement career as a reserve deputy and eventually served as deputy investigator and undersheriff.

In addition to his work as a law enforcement officer, Randy was an EMT for the Brown County Rescue Squad and the county emergency preparedness coordinator.

I am grateful for Senior Investigator Linck's 40 years of service and sacrifice to northeast Kansas. I wish him and his family the best in his well-deserved retirement.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, teach us to number our days, not that we would count down to the next milestone or fear the future ahead of us, but that we would come to value and to appreciate the moments You have given us.

Teach us to number the days of our work, that we would understand that each day matters. The decisions we make, the encounters we have, the

privilege we have been given to labor in Your vineyard, all that we do contributes to the work to which You have entrusted us.

Teach us to number the days with our loved ones, that we would seize the opportunity to acknowledge even the smallest gesture of love and appreciate the greatest favor You have bestowed on us, to share this life with the precious people we call friends and the special ones we know as family.

Teach us to number the days of our lives, that we would use our time on Earth to appreciate the freedoms You have endowed us, to seek the wisdom You reveal to us, and to demonstrate the mercy and love You have shown us.

Teach us to number our days, that we may live this day wisely.

We offer this prayer in Your sovereign name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CORPORAL BILL SCHROEDER

(Ms. DE LA CRUZ asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a local hero, Corporal Bill Schroeder, who is retiring after 28 years in law enforcement. Starting as a reserve deputy, he joined the Guadalupe County Sheriff's Office in 2001 and exemplifies public service.

Corporal Schroeder is a father, a mentor, and a community pillar who has inspired many to serve, including his daughter, a dispatcher at the sheriff's office. As a true salt of the earth, he leaves a legacy of friendship, courage, and integrity that will continue guiding us.

On behalf of this distinguished body, I thank Corporal Schroeder and congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement. His family, friends, and I are so proud of him. He fought the good fight, he finished the race, and he kept the faith all the while.

May God bless him, and may God bless Texas.

CATHY GERAGHTY

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my dear friend and champion of biodiversity, Cathy Geraghty.

I am pleased to announce that Cathy is the 2023 recipient of the Dr. George B. Rabb Force of Nature Award. During her two-decade-long career with the Forest Preserves of Cook County, Cathy has pushed the organization forward in tackling conservation issues, particularly with her drafting of the Next Century Conservation Plan.

With an implementation strategy that includes volunteer outreach, tying the preserves to the economic future of Chicago, restoring 30,000 acres to full health, and leading with transparency, this plan will continue to improve our forest preserves and increase the community that supports them.

When she isn't working with the Forest Preserves of Cook County, she spends her free time serving as a proud member of the Chicago Wilderness Alliance Steering Committee, who has awarded her this honor. Cathy is a true force of nature, and I could not be more proud of my friend and the work she has done to support our environment.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize the upcoming celebrations for National School Choice Week. Partnering with over 27,000 schools around the country, the focus is to inform parents of the education options available, meeting the needs for each family.

This year, there will be over 390 bipartisan events in South Carolina bringing attention to the education options available. Districts are beginning to provide open enrollment practices, such as Richland County School District One.

Open enrollment allows choosing the right school for unique learning and childcare needs. Educators are also appreciated, beginning with my wife, Roxanne, a dedicated educator and teacher.

I am also grateful for South Carolina Governor Henry McMaster and Superintendent of Education Ellen Weaver for their promoting leadership.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden open borders for terrorists. It is sadly clear there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent, as has been warned by the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the voters of Iowa for supporting Donald Trump.

PROPOSED FDA MENTHOL BAN

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the President is heading to North Carolina to talk about jobs, there is contemplation of finalizing a rule to ban menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars.

I want to make clear: I came to Congress to be a champion for jobs, not get rid of them. If finalized, this rule would rip jobs away from eastern North Carolina and our State. We must be concerned about health and economic wellness. It is about the 27,000 jobs in North Carolina that hang in the balance.

Menthol cigarettes support over 6,000 jobs, with 2,000 in manufacturing alone. These jobs aren't just numbers; they represent people, families, homes, and the American Dream. It is about how we put food on the table and send our kids to school.

Wiping out these jobs is unacceptable. I will stay in this fight today, tomorrow, and into the future for eastern North Carolina.

PAUL KERCHUM

(Mr. CISCOMANI asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the legacy of Paul Kerchum. At the time of his death, Mr. Kerchum was one of the last survivors of the Bataan Death March.

Paul enlisted in the military in 1938, beginning a 29-year military career. In 1942, Paul was taken as a POW in the Philippines and forced to march for 65 miles in what is now known as the Bataan Death March.

Following his retirement in 1966, he and his wife, Gloria, made Arizona their home. For Paul, civilian life included hours of community service and impactful public speaking, sharing his story of bravery and courage.

Later this month, the Benson Municipal Airport will be renamed in Paul's honor.

Mr. Speaker, while we will never be able to fully express our gratitude for Paul's service, we hope this serves as a small token of appreciation.

TRUMP EMOLUMENT CLAUSE

(Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently joined colleagues on the House Oversight Committee in releasing a report confirming what we have known all along, that Donald Trump and his family, especially the Kushners, participated in the largest Presidential grift in history.

We have records of 20 foreign governments funneling millions through Trump properties and into Donald Trump's pockets while he was President, all in violation of the U.S. Constitution.

This is just the tip of the iceberg. We have only been able to access payments and illegal gifts from four Trump properties. Trump owns hundreds of properties and businesses.

Despite the different cover-ups, we can still prove that Trump and Jared Kushner were making national security decisions while he and his family were getting bribes and paid by the same foreign powers. Millions were being spent by countries like China and Saudi Arabia, and we need immediate answers on why Jared Kushner got a \$2 billion Saudi investment fund just months after leaving the White House.

We have been raising the alarm on this issue over and over. The corruption is unacceptable, and we must hold the Trump crime family accountable.

NO TAX DOLLARS TOWARD ABORTION

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade case, which prevented States from protecting unborn children from the mass murder we now call abortion.

Thankfully, last year, that case was overturned by Dobbs v. Jackson. That case was celebrated across the country by everyone who wants to protect these sweet little babies.

The day that case was decided, I went out to the front of the Supreme Court, and I saw crowds of young people celebrating the victory. They were playing music, blowing bubbles, and just having a great time.

I also saw crowds of angry pro-abortion activists chanting, holding obscene signs, and even crying. They were mourning the fact that abortion couldn't be forced on States that didn't want it anymore. Unfortunately, some of these people were Members of Congress.

Every step of the way, my pro-abortion colleagues have blocked our efforts to protect babies from abortion. They have pushed for taxpayers to fund it. My constituents don't want their tax dollars paying for doctors to kill babies. They call it healthcare, to make it seem less evil than it is, but, Mr. Speaker, it is like putting lipstick on a pig. It just doesn't work.

When faced with the true horrors of abortion, most Americans don't want to see this happen, and they certainly don't want to be forced to pay for it. It is sad that I even need to say this, but we will fight to protect babies from being killed as long as I am in Congress.

STATUE OF LIBERTY

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I issued a challenge yesterday to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop lying and be honest about what they actually mean when they are talking about changes to our immigration system and at the border, and it looks like they are taking my advice.

Let's look at this board. We have a fellow Floridian on the record saying she wants family separation. Seems like a nice sentiment coming from someone who is a new mother.

We have our infamous colleague from Georgia saying that she can't wait for mass deportations to start on day one of the Trump administration.

Then we also have the criminally indicted former President himself saying that he wants to scrap birthright U.S. citizenship.

I want to remind everybody that the promise of this country, the promise written on the Statue of Liberty, is one that welcomes all folks who are most vulnerable with open arms; like my mother did when she came here from Cuba as a refugee and asylum seeker.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in the House need to stop lying to the American people. If you don't believe in the promise of this country or in our values, you don't believe in the beacon of hope that is the Statue of Liberty.

SUPPORTING ORPHAN WELL GRANTS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, the Orphan Well Grant Flexibility Act.

We all know that abandoned wells, either unplugged or improperly plugged, can pose serious environmental and health risks to surrounding communities. In Pennsylvania alone, there are more than 27,000 documented abandoned and orphaned oil and gas wells across the State.

It is not just a Pennsylvania issue, however, as abandoned wells are found across the country. The Orphan Well Grant Flexibility Act, which I introduced alongside my colleague Congressman DELUZIO from Pennsylvania, will empower States to maximize their flexibility when plugging abandoned oil wells and cut red tape to accelerate environmental rehabilitation.

We have many of the resources we need to plug these wells, and now it is our job to ensure that they are able to be used for their intended purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman DELUZIO for joining me in leading this critical effort, and I encourage all of

my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING DETROIT LIONS AND QB JARED GOFF

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as a proud southern Californian, I rise to congratulate my good friend, Representative KILDEE from Michigan, on the hard-fought victory last Sunday by his beloved Detroit Lions against the Los Angeles Rams, 24-23.

Before the game, I had agreed with Representative KILDEE that should the Lions beat the Rams, I would be happy to publicly congratulate the good people of Michigan, who have been waiting more than three decades for a Lions playoff win, as well as Lions starting quarterback Jared Goff, who is a product, I might add, of the University of California, where he played from 2013 to 2015.

After his college career, Goff was then drafted by the Rams with the first overall pick in 2016, after which he took us to the Super Bowl in 2018.

While it pains me that Representative KILDEE is not here praising Rams quarterback and 2021 Super Bowl champion Matthew Stafford right now, I genuinely wish Goff, the Lions, and all of my friends in Michigan great success in the weeks ahead.

KFIR'S FIRST BIRTHDAY SPENT AS HAMAS' HOSTAGE

(Mr. BERGMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Kfir Bibas, whose first birthday is today. Instead of spending it in the embrace of his family, Kfir is at the mercy of some of the world's most vile terrorists.

Along with his 4-year-old brother and parents, the sweet redheaded boy became the youngest of more than 240 hostages who were brutally kidnapped by evil Hamas militants on October 7.

In such desperate times, I am reminded of the promises of our Almighty God, particularly those which set apart our children as the apple of His eye.

Mark 9:42 tells us: "If anyone causes one of these little ones . . . to stumble, it would be better for them if a large millstone were hung around their neck and they were thrown into the sea."

So sayeth Mark.

Today, I demand that these reprehensible animals release Kfir immediately, along with all the remaining hostages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and fellow Americans to stand with Kfir and Israel and to pray for peace.

ASSAULT ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONTINUES

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in the last 1½ years, we have seen the horrific impact of overturning the right to an abortion, and the assault continues.

The Supreme Court just announced that it would be hearing a challenge to the Biden administration's policy that abortion remains a form of emergency treatment for women whose lives are at risk.

This was done to ensure that even in States that have draconian abortion bans, doctors are able to provide needed emergency medical care.

It is unconscionable that doctors are calling their lawyers while patients are dying on the operating table.

Too often the so-called pregnancy crisis centers are a sham that peddle misinformation, and they certainly shouldn't be eligible for Federal dollars meant to help people in need.

Why are we wasting our time on culture wars instead of policies that actually help American families?

This is a disservice to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

SUPPORTING PREGNANT AND PARENTING WOMEN AND FAMILIES ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 969, I call up the bill (H.R. 6918) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to House Resolution 969, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-20 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6918

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PREGNANCY CENTERS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not finalize, implement, or enforce, with respect to expenditures for any pregnancy center, the modification to section 263.11 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as described in the proposed regulation set forth beginning on page 67697 of volume 88 of the Federal Register, or any substantially similar regulatory action.

(b) *DEFINITION OF PREGNANCY CENTER.*—In subsection (a), the term "pregnancy center" means any organization, such as a pregnancy resource center, pregnancy help center or organization, or pregnancy medical center, that—

(1) supports protecting the life of the mother and the unborn child; and

(2) offers resources and services to mothers, fathers, and families, including but not limited to relationship counseling, prenatal and pregnancy education, pregnancy testing, diapers, baby clothes, or material supports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, right after the Dobbs Supreme Court decision, nearly 100 pregnancy resource centers, pro-life organizations, and churches were smashed, ransacked, vandalized, graffitied, and even firebombed. While the violence has subsided, pregnancy resource centers around the country are still under attack, this time by the Biden administration.

Last year, the Biden administration proposed a rule at the Department of Health and Human Services that blocks States from funding pregnancy resource centers through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program.

These centers exist to provide care and support for pregnant women looking for an alternative to abortion. Mothers can receive help for themselves and the health of their unborn child, including everything from diapers and prenatal vitamins to transportation and parenting classes.

The Biden administration's proposed rule has the potential to impact over 2,700 such centers around the country that in 2019 alone provided medical and material support to over 2 million women and families.

Nothing in the bipartisan law that created TANF gives the Biden administration the authority to unfairly target pregnancy resource centers. In fact, it prohibits the government from restricting TANF funds, yet that is exactly what the Biden administration is trying to do.

This funding is critical to keeping the doors open and providing care for women seeking help. For example, in my home State of Missouri, TANF provides \$3 of every \$4 the State provides to pregnancy resource centers, where

expectant moms can get everything from diapers and food to transportation, parenting skills classes, and prenatal care. These are services that every single expectant mother needs for a healthy pregnancy, and pregnancy resource centers have stepped in to fill these basic needs.

The hypocrisy on the part of the Biden administration could not be more clear. They claim to support a woman's right to choose her own healthcare while at the same time the President is making it harder for moms to choose life for their unborn child so his administration can funnel even more resources to organizations like Planned Parenthood. If this rule takes effect, pregnant women in America will have fewer healthcare options and less access to care.

As tomorrow's March for Life will remind us all, the rights of mothers and the unborn must be protected.

I thank Representative FISCHBACH for introducing this bill that would end the Biden administration's misguided rule targeting pregnancy resource centers and for her unwavering support of women and the unborn. I also thank Representatives TENNEY and CHRIS SMITH for cosponsoring the bill and for their leadership on this issue. Each one has been a tireless fighter to advance the right to life for decades.

I hope that each one of my colleagues will support this legislation, stand up for mothers, and protect the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the majority is pushing yet another extreme anti-choice bill just in time for the big antiwoman rally in Washington this weekend.

Rather than helping hardworking American families, Republicans are working to divert Federal funds from needy children in order to serve their own extremist agenda that is out of step with the majority of Americans.

Republicans are attempting to funnel more Federal funds into dangerous anti-abortion facilities, the so-called pregnancy centers. The other side doesn't even dispute that these centers have a specific agenda: to do everything they can within their power to coerce women into doing what the center thinks is best for the women, not what is in the best interest of the mother.

These so-called crisis pregnancy centers provide deceptive and inaccurate information to pregnant women.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program is intended to help low-income women and families, not to reduce abortions. This funding was not intended to bankroll deceptive anti-abortion centers that misrepresent themselves as healthcare facilities. These facilities often delay access to care, and they use emotional manipulation to divert access to care from licensed medical professionals.

The American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and even the National Institutes of Health have all issued reports citing numerous ethical and medical concerns with these so-called centers.

These facilities are unregulated. They have no legal obligation to provide pregnant people with accurate information. They are not subject to HIPAA protections, nor are they required by law to maintain client confidentiality. In many cases, they don't even have licensed medical professionals on staff.

One woman who sought out care at a Florida women's health center in Jacksonville was told that having an abortion would cause breast cancer. This is patently false. Another was advised to relax at the beach after being incorrectly informed she was carrying an ectopic pregnancy.

These facilities are unsafe. Multiple physician organizations have stated that they are unethical. The bottom line is that anti-abortion clinics should not receive Federal dollars to continue spreading false information to low-income, often minority, women seeking comprehensive, nonjudgmental fact- and science-based reproductive healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair for the opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. Speaker, this administration and my colleagues on the left claim that they want to give pregnant women every option. If that were true, then they would have no problem with this bill.

The fact is the left is only interested in funding avenues that encourage women to have abortions. This line of thinking belittles the abilities of women to make informed decisions across the country.

Unfortunately for women everywhere, the left is shouting lies and inaccuracies at the top of their lungs, calling pregnancy centers a scam. These people clearly have not been to a pregnancy center. I have been to many.

The fact is pregnancy centers empower women. Take, for example, Kristen in Louisiana. She thought her pregnancy was the end of the world. She contacted her local pregnancy center, sharing her concerns about single parenting, including physical, emotional, and financial concerns. She was so relieved to work with a team that was "confidential and nonjudgmental every step of the way." They informed her of all the resources available to her, including free Lamaze and parenting classes and even scholarships.

She would never have known about all of these resources available to her had she not gone to a pregnancy center

that was committed to empowering her with the knowledge, information, and support she needed to feel confident in choosing life.

Today, nobody could imagine their lives without Kristen's daughter. Since working with her local pregnancy center, she has gotten married. Her husband adopted her daughter, and the two went on to have more children together. Kristen graduated college, got her master's degree, is a professor, and is applying to the Ph.D. programs.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, conservatives are here for unborn babies and their mothers. I introduced the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act to ensure the administration does not block funding for pregnancy care centers across the country like the one that helped Kristen. They are providing support and empowering women to raise their families.

□ 1230

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will point out that one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle mentioned some violence, and I will talk about the violence that happens at abortion provider clinics.

They have been compiling statistics on instances of violence and disruption against abortion providers for more than 40 years, and there is definite uptick in the amount of clinic invasions, obstructions, blockades, targeted mail, and harassing phone calls.

In recent years, we have seen incidents of violence with devastating impacts. For example, in November 2015, three people were murdered and nine injured when Robert Dear brought an assault-style rifle to a Planned Parenthood healthcare center in Colorado Springs and opened fire.

A gunman also attacked a Planned Parenthood clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, in the early hours of January 22, 2021. In December 2021, the same clinic was burned to the ground by arsonists.

If you want to talk about incidents of violence, let's talk about the onslaught of violent attacks that abortion providers have had to deal with for over the past 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee and a champion for women's rights.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6918, the deceptively named Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

This bill has a simple but negative purpose: It would divert Temporary Assistance for Needy Families dollars that successfully keep needy children and families from poverty to anti-abortion centers.

These so-called crisis pregnancy centers masquerade as healthcare facilities, even going so far as to have staff

dress in scrubs and white coats to mimic medical professionals.

Let's be clear: They are organizations attempting to strong-arm, manipulate, and coerce pregnant people seeking abortion care into carrying pregnancies to full term, and this is to the great disadvantage of women in need.

These anti-abortion centers are not actual medical facilities, so they are not covered by the privacy and security rules of HIPAA. With little or no consequence, staff at these facilities can lie to patients and share their personal information with anti-abortion extremists in order to survey, harass, pressure, or prosecute those seeking abortion care.

The lies these centers tell can have profound impacts on a patient's health. In Iowa, an OB/GYN has seen patients who were told at these centers that using contraceptives was the same as having an abortion.

In Massachusetts, an unqualified staff member at an anti-abortion center failed to diagnose a woman's ectopic pregnancy. That woman later required emergency surgery. Worst of all, there are no consequences to these centers for this.

A recent study of 607 anti-abortion centers across nine States found that they "promoted patently false and/or biased medical claims about pregnancy, abortion, contraception, and reproductive healthcare providers." Fewer than half of these centers reported having a licensed medical professional on staff.

Unfortunately for the American people, spreading misinformation about abortion and ultimately implementing a national ban on abortion seems to be unifying objectives for Republicans here in Congress.

During our markup last week, Democrats offered a series of amendments to allow funding to these centers if they could prove that they provide medically accurate information, not harm women's health, and did not mislead or coerce women into visiting their centers.

Committee Republicans rejected all of those amendments, making it clear that their purpose is coercive propaganda, not support for pregnant women.

If Republicans want to support expecting new parents, House Democrats would welcome their backing of a fully expanded child tax credit, universal paid family and medical leave, and affordable childcare.

However, instead of considering these measures or even doing the basic business of keeping the government open, we are debating a bill going nowhere in the Senate and intended, instead, to score political points with anti-abortion groups gathering in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 6918.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of legislation introduced by my good friend from Minnesota, a strong voice for the voiceless, Mrs. FISCHBACH.

The Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Families Act blocks a disastrous rule proposed by the Biden administration which would strip funding from pregnancy resource centers.

As we heard in last week's markup, those who oppose this bill have even admitted that they are pro-life starting only 2 seconds after you are born.

Ironically, so many on the other side of the aisle, most of whom can't even define what a woman is, not only share in this delusion, but also claim to be the party of women's rights.

Now, I am sorry. We just heard that these centers are masquerading as women's healthcare facilities. You want to talk about masquerading as providing women's healthcare? Let's look at their pro-abortion facilities. They are not providing healthcare. Mr. Speaker, 97 to 98 percent of the services that they provide are abortions, not healthcare services.

My colleagues on the left claim that it is somehow worse for a mother to have access to the vital services offered by pregnancy resource centers. In fact, the gentlewoman from California defined them as extremists.

Let's explore the services that these pregnancy centers offer that my colleagues find so offensive and so extreme.

Let's see. How does it hurt for a young family to have access to free prenatal vitamins, formula, and diapers? How about free maternity and baby clothing? How about educational classes on unplanned pregnancy, childbirth, parenting, and adoption information? How about free life skills training and help with housing? How extreme? How offensive?

As is clear by the nearly 1 million women assisted by pregnancy resource centers in 2022, they provide an extraordinary service to women and families across the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, Texas is home to 200 pregnancy resource centers, and I will not stand by as the Biden administration attempts to take away choice from pregnant women, nor will I stand by and allow them to block funding for the vital programs offered by these pregnancy centers.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that unlike these so-called pregnancy centers, Planned Parenthood actually gives women factually and scientifically accurate information and the full range of choices, while the pregnancy centers have a clear agenda and only one point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms.

MOORE), a champion for women everywhere.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill that diverts funds from the welfare program and the TANF program to these crisis pregnancy centers.

Before I get into my argument, let me say how I think it is wonderful that these centers provide clothing, formula, diapers, and comfort to a woman who is planning to have a child and they are able to provide these resources.

However, I do agree with my colleagues that have argued that these so-called crisis pregnancy centers don't meet the mark with regard to meeting a woman who is actually having a crisis pregnancy.

When a woman is having a crisis pregnancy and presents herself, she is having a crisis because she has mental health issues, some social problems, she may have health problems, maybe she is 10 years old and finds herself pregnant as a result of incest. Maybe—and I have known cases like this—she has found herself pregnant and is now needing treatment for cancer and wondering what to do because she is going to have to have chemo and radiation and finds herself pregnant.

The problem with these crisis pregnancy centers is that they only have one agenda, and that is to make sure you stay pregnant. They are going to continue to ignore the facts of your particular case which makes it a crisis pregnancy for you.

I will tell you that I have great credibility on this issue. I am a mother. I am a grandmother of three granddaughters. I am a great-grandmother of three great-granddaughters. I have held women's hands when they have pushed and given birth, and I have held their hands when they needed an abortion because of reasons that are none of our business around here.

I think that if we are going to divert the measly \$16.5 billion block grant that we have to share all across the country that we should not be diverting it to these 2,500 care centers that don't meet the TANF goals of helping poor women deal with their poverty beyond 6 weeks after giving birth.

It is fine to help women who are pregnant, but what do you do after you have given birth and we have diverted all these funds to places like pregnancy resource centers that care only about stopping you from having an abortion?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

Mr. Speaker, pregnancy centers play a vital role in supporting women facing unexpected or unplanned pregnancies. Since the Dobbs ruling, pregnancy centers have been under vicious attack by the radical left, especially in my home State of Illinois.

Why? All for simply loving and supporting vulnerable women. There are approximately 3,000 pregnancy centers across the Nation, serving nearly 2 million mothers, fathers, and families completely free of charge.

In 2019 alone, their services and material assistance totaled over \$266 million.

The goal of pregnancy centers is to support the mother and her unborn child. However, they also offer many resources and services, including relationship counseling, prenatal and pregnancy education, pregnancy testing, diapers, and baby clothes, just to name a few.

Women in crisis situations deserve to be protected and supported, period.

Banning funding to pregnancy centers not only discriminates against women but deprives them of the vital care and materials they desperately need, including information on the development of the baby and an ultrasound.

As a volunteer and supporter of crisis pregnancy centers in Illinois, I have seen firsthand how they minister to women in need. Unlike Planned Parenthood, pregnancy centers don't prey upon vulnerable women and coerce them into making decisions they will regret for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative FISCHBACH for leading the way to protect the essential work of pregnancy centers, and I look forward to the House swiftly passing this bill.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another step in the Republican crusade to impose a national abortion ban to treat women across America the way Texans have been abused already. And this drastic, harmful strategy is about so much more than abortion healthcare.

It is about the right to life for expectant mothers. It is about the right of a mother to be physically able to deliver a future baby. What happened to Texan Kate Cox is so very instructive. A mother herself, she was advised that having another child could not be possible if she was forced to deliver a fetus that could not live, yet Republicans insisted that she do just that. Under the Texas vigilante law, medical professionals—indeed, anyone who provides advice about an abortion, even for a child who is the victim of rape or incest—there are immediate penalties for them.

□ 1245

As they seek to cut support for Women, Infants, and Children funding, House Republicans want to divert tax money to these propaganda centers, usually posing as a health center but lacking any medical professional staff—public funds to centers designed to fearmonger and intimidate vulnerable women.

While Republicans demand protection of life from the moment of conception, they show so little interest in life after delivery. Women deserve healthcare protection free from coercion. For every American whose freedom is threatened by Republican interference, both patients and their doctors, I strongly oppose this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, which will block a Biden administration proposed rule prohibiting States from funding pregnancy resource centers which support the lives of both mothers and their unborn children.

Pregnancy resource centers offer compassionate support and care to women as they choose to become mothers and bring life into this world. Unfortunately, the Biden administration is trying to take away resources from facilities that provide women and families with quality healthcare services, emotional support, and supplies, like diapers. The result is pregnant women having less access to maternal care critical to both the health of the mother and unborn child. This is despicable.

As a pharmacist, I swore an oath to do no harm and to protect the sanctity of human life. That means standing up for pregnancy resource centers, which in my district provide valuable, life-changing support for women and children.

I encourage any of my colleagues who are unwilling to support these facilities to go and visit them. I have, and I saw for myself how the work they do is changing lives.

We value women, we value life, and this bill prioritizes both.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and prevent the defunding of these critical health centers.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 6918 because it is just another attempt by the Republican leadership to advance their extremist war on women.

As we again face another Republican-manufactured shutdown crisis, the Republican leadership advances this bill to divert money intended for poor children to anti-abortion propaganda and facilities that provide deceptive and inaccurate information.

The House should take immediate action to eliminate child poverty, not promote efforts to restrict women's reproductive choices.

Alarming, just one year after the Republican-led expiration of Democratic poverty-lowering investments in workers and families, the child poverty rate more than doubled, causing the biggest one-year increase in poverty we have ever seen.

If Republicans truly wanted to help pregnant and parenting families, they

would fully restore the child tax credit, dramatically increase childcare funding to address the childcare crisis, and make it easier to get critical services like Medicaid.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his tremendous leadership on this and so many other important issues, including life issues. I thank MICHELLE FISCHBACH for her brave and courageous leadership, and our Speaker for making sure that this legislation got to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, at a New Jersey pregnancy resource center dinner, two women, through tears of joy, expressed their deep and abiding gratitude for the incredible love, respect, and care that persuaded them to reverse their decision to abort their babies. They spoke about how desperate they were, even hopeless. They spoke of the pressure that they felt to abort, until they met the director of the pregnancy resource center, who reached out to both of them in a gentle and nonjudgmental way.

They chose life, and thanked God, the director, and the pregnancy resource center for helping them to avert the loss of their babies' lives.

Then, two teenaged girls took to the podium and spoke about their lives—school, sports, friends—and their reverence for the sanctity of all human life. Near the end of their remarks—I didn't see this coming nor did many people in the room—they turned toward the director of the center and thanked her for being there for their moms through those difficult times and said: If you weren't there for them, we would be dead. Two wonderful young women talking about how without the pregnancy center, they would have been dead.

There are more than 2,700 pregnancy resource centers throughout the United States. Each and every one of them is an oasis of love, compassion, empathy, respect, and care for both mothers and their precious children.

Americans agree with the noble work of pregnancy care centers. The new Marist national poll, released just yesterday, found that 83 percent of all Americans, including 75 percent of Democrats, support—I say again support—pregnancy resource centers.

There is a growing number of people throughout this country in this great human rights movement who really protect the unborn child and their mothers and stand with women and their children. We reject the violence of abortion, dismemberment, child beatings, and abortion pills.

How does the pill work? It literally starves the baby to death. That is how they die; they starve to death.

Congresswoman MICHELLE FISCHBACH's legislation prohibits Biden's new policy proposal that discriminates against pregnancy resource

centers. The bill, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act ensures that pregnancy resource centers cannot be excluded or restricted from receiving TANF funding as proposed by the rule that is being pushed by the President.

The Biden administration and some Governors and lawmakers continue, Mr. Speaker, to smear and misrepresent the noble work of pregnancy resource centers. We can't allow that to happen.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), my esteemed colleague.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous H.R. 6918.

This legislation is the House Republicans' latest attempt to spread inaccurate information while advancing their extreme anti-abortion agenda and attacking reproductive freedom.

This bill would divert TANF funding that is intended to help struggling families and children, the very families that face higher maternal and infant death rates than some Third World countries. It would divert funding to help these families to fund anti-abortion crisis pregnancy centers whose sole purpose is to coerce, deceive, and manipulate pregnant patients into carrying their pregnancies to term. These centers often share biased and medically inaccurate information, purposefully misleading patients into believing they can get the healthcare they need. Abortion care is healthcare.

These centers delay care, deny access to qualified medical professionals, and that is critically dangerous for pregnant patients who need timely healthcare services. These centers are unethical and jeopardize patients' well-being, yet extreme House Republicans want the Federal Government to support them at the expense of the vulnerable children and families, again, who face higher infant mortality rates than in many Third World countries.

This legislation exemplifies Republicans' bad-faith efforts. Essential TANF funds should not be used to help these programs instead of helping needy families. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YAKYM).

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

Mr. Speaker, pregnancy centers provide vital services to expectant mothers and new parents at no cost. This includes pregnancy tests, ultrasounds, parenting classes, diapers and wipes, formula, and outfits.

When my wife and I had very little money and we were expecting our first child, we turned to one such pregnancy center for an ultrasound. Due to my personal experience with that pregnancy center, I find the other side of

the aisle's characterization of these pregnancy centers to be nothing short of insulting.

The Biden administration is trying to circumvent Congress and take away this critical lifeline from low-income women by stopping States from using Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, funds for pregnancy centers. Instead of securing our border, the Biden administration is trying to take away diapers and parenting classes from low-income women.

The Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act would stop this harmful policy in its tracks and ensure pregnancy centers continue to provide valuable services to low-income pregnant women and new parents.

I thank my colleague, Mrs. FISCHBACH, for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are insulted by the issues that we are raising because I have a brief here in front of me from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists which talks about the fact that these pregnancy crisis centers use digital marketing tactics to target people seeking information about abortion care. According to their studies, 71 percent of these centers use deceptive means, such as spreading thoroughly debunked misinformation, and 38 percent of them do not clearly state on their home page that they don't provide abortion care.

If you are mad at us for raising these points, talk to the College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, because they have done an in-depth, comprehensive study to talk about the repeated misinformation that these centers give out to women who are in crisis. The deceptive information that they give to them puts these women's lives at risk. If you are so pro-life, why do you not care about the life of the mother?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my, my, my, Republicans are at it again, trying every which way to obstruct legal access to abortion, preventing women from the freedom of making their own choice of when or whether to start or grow a family.

This time, Republicans want to fund fake clinics run by anti-abortion activists who deceptively provide women with misleading information with one purpose: to scare, disgrace, or pressure them from getting an abortion.

Shamefully, in order to bankroll these fake centers, this Republican bill grabs funding from a program designed to assist needy pregnant women and children get back on their feet.

Overwhelmingly, Americans believe that women should make their own personal healthcare decisions without interference by politicians.

This proposed legislation is dangerous hypocrisy on steroids and not worthy of support.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Democrats and the Biden administration are purposely targeting and misrepresenting pregnancy centers in their proposed rule and seeking to intimidate States that fund them.

Pregnancy resource centers play a vital role to both mothers and fathers, empowering them in their decision to choose life for their baby, by providing realistic alternatives in stark contrast to organizations exclusively focused on abortion.

There is no deceit underlying pregnancy centers. They are another option for women who are looking for an alternative to abortion. It is disgraceful that Democrats mischaracterize these organizations in an effort to limit a woman's choice to raise her child.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

□ 1300

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this bill.

Listening to my colleagues across the aisle talk about pregnancy centers is astounding. They appear to have never set foot in one and have fallen for the abortion industry's lies, hook, line, and sinker.

I served on the board of a pregnancy center in my area for many years. During my service, we even contracted for a mobile sonogram to go to help the ladies who were in disadvantaged areas and lacked transportation to get to the pregnancy center.

The sonogram is the greatest tool in use against the death culture. In Plano, Texas, if you find yourself unexpectedly pregnant without a support network, feeling lost and anxious, you can go to a number of local pregnancy centers. There, you will be met by kind, caring, compassionate staff, both volunteer nurses and medical doctors. They offer pregnancy tests, ultrasounds, counseling, classes, and testing, all at no cost. There are nearly 3,000 of these centers around the Nation, mainly run by local volunteers simply because they want to help.

In 2021, the pregnancy centers served almost 1 million women and their babies, and this number does not even include the fathers, who are part of this equation.

Yet, in spite of all this good, the administration has decided to punish pregnancy centers. Why? Because they do not perform abortions.

Let that sink in. Your tax dollars fund the death culture but not the life culture. Pregnancy centers give out free diapers, parenting classes, and ultrasounds, and their volunteers lend a helping hand to moms across America who decide to keep their unborn person. Because these centers will not bend the knee to the President's radical abortion agenda, they are going to be punished.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill and to stand with pregnant moms and their babies.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just love to point out to anybody who cares for real facts a 2006 congressional report and investigation that found false and misleading health information provided by federally funded pregnancy resource centers. That will give you an accurate picture of just what goes on behind those doors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SÁNCHEZ for yielding and for her leadership on this important issue.

I rise today in opposition to the so-called Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, which would prevent the Department of Health and Human Services from restricting funds to crisis pregnancy centers.

We know, as we have heard, and is included in the report that Representative SÁNCHEZ just mentioned, that crisis pregnancy centers prey on people at a very vulnerable time. They often spread misinformation to further what is clearly an anti-choice agenda. They routinely use deceptive advertising to get people into the doors, and then they mislead them about the services they provide.

In fact, a center in Ohio was caught making outlandish assertions, including that "condoms were only 50 percent effective, the spread of STDs could only be prevented if people followed 'God's plan' of avoiding sex before marriage, and that if a woman who has an STD gets an abortion, 'your STDs travel up your cervix into your organs and could kill you.'"

This deception is outrageous, dangerous, and unconscionable, which is why I have introduced the Stop Anti-abortion Disinformation Act, H.R. 2736, to direct the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules prohibiting unfair or deceptive advertising of abortion services.

This, Mr. Speaker, will really make a difference because anyone seeking reproductive care should have access to a real healthcare provider that will provide them with comprehensive and accurate medical information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, anyone seeking reproductive care should have access to a real healthcare provider that will provide them with real, comprehensive, and accurate medical information. That is not what they get at pregnancy resource centers. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, introduced by Congresswoman FISCHBACH, and I thank her for introducing this important bill to push back against the Biden administration's shocking demonization of pregnancy resource centers.

These centers provide loving care and resources for pregnant women and mothers of newborns who face trying times.

Pregnancy resource centers provide a wide array of services, including free pregnancy tests, ultrasounds, parenting and prenatal education, and lactation consultations. They give out free diapers, formula, and baby clothes for mothers of newborns.

In my district, the Sarasota Medical Pregnancy Center does tremendous work as a lifeline for pregnant women in need. They lovingly care for these women who face challenging circumstances. There are trained medical professionals present who perform free ultrasounds and provide the care these women want and need.

Unfortunately, Democrats continually seek to delegitimize these vital organizations simply because they provide an alternative to abortion.

After the Dobbs decision was released, nearly 100 pregnancy crisis centers, including 4 in my home State of Florida, were attacked and vandalized by leftwing radical groups. Despite repeated pleas from Members of Congress, our Department of Justice largely refused to actively investigate this organized criminal activity.

Now, the Biden administration is singling out pregnancy crisis centers to exclude them from eligibility under the TANF program, all because these centers encourage women to have their babies.

It was a deliberate act by the Biden administration to appease radical pro-abortion activists by attacking pregnancy centers that provide so much to pregnant women.

This bill simply ensures that the Biden administration cannot exclude these centers from TANF eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support pregnancy resource centers, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise to oppose yet another extreme Republican assault on families and reproductive freedoms.

This thinly veiled attack on abortion rights would let States divert critical Federal funds meant for struggling families with children into shady anti-choice groups.

These so-called crisis pregnancy centers claim to help women, but they are unregulated, unlicensed, and not even required to have medical professionals. They say whatever they want, and they

offer inaccurate, biased information meant to scare women and limit their choices.

Worse, this bill diverts vital TANF funds from needy children and steers it to dangerous anti-choice outfits that will help Republicans secure their extreme national abortion ban.

With partial government funding about to run out, why do Republicans waste our time on these shameful stunts?

I want to be clear: This deceptive bill does not help pregnant women. It simply funds groups that lie to them.

As a woman and mother of three young adult children, I ask my Republican colleagues to truly help women and families and stop deceiving and defunding them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this deceptive bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last year, Missouri provided \$6.3 million in TANF funding to pregnancy resource centers. This funding is provided for mothers and fathers for non-medical support, such as baby clothes and formula, and support for families until the age of 1.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Missouri Department of Social Services to the Administration for Children and Families opposing any restrictions on using TANF for these critical services.

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES,
November 30, 2023.

Re Strengthening Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) as a Safety Net and Work Program (RIN 0970-AC99).

Administration for Children and Families,
Office of Family Assistance,
Washington, DC.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Missouri Department of Social Services (DSS) has reviewed in detail the Notice of Public Rulemaking (NPRM), RIN 0970-AC99, issued by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on October 2, 2023. Below, please find DSS' comments on the proposed rule. DSS believes the proposed rule should be modified significantly before being enacted. Our comments are in three main areas:

Allowability of youth services designed to break the cycle of poverty.

Allowability of programs that support pregnant women and positive outcomes for their children, and

Allowability of using third party expenditures to meet TANF MOE requirements.

In addition, we emphasize the importance of a phased implementation to allow states time to adjust to the final rule, regardless of any revisions made subsequent to the issuance of the NPRM.

We elaborate on these points separately below.

ALLOW A BROADER RANGE OF YOUTH SERVICES DESIGNED TO BREAK THE CYCLE OF POVERTY

One of the hallmarks of the TANF program is that it allowed flexibility for states to best serve the populations in their states. The 1999 TANF Final Rule, 64 FR 17720 et seq. (April 12, 1999), drives home this point repeatedly in its preamble:

“The law gives States, and federally recognized Indian tribes, the authority to use Federal welfare funds ‘in any manner that is reasonably calculated to accomplish the purpose’ of the new program. It provides them

broad flexibility to set eligibility rules and decide what benefits are most appropriate. It also enables States to implement their new programs without getting the ‘approval’ of the Federal government. In short, it offers States and Tribes an opportunity to try new, far-reaching changes that can respond more effectively to the needs of families within their own unique environments.”

States have used this flexibility to fund a wide range of programs, including programs focused on serving youth in afterschool settings. The NPRM suggests that these programs, which provide a valuable social support and help reduce school dropout and teen pregnancy rates, would no longer be allowable except to the extent that “pregnancy prevention programming is a part of an ongoing program.” States did not make this connection between after-school programs and TANF Purpose 3 on their own. ACF issued guidance at the outset of the TANF program that explicitly made the connection between youth programs and TANF purpose 3:

“A State may use its TANF or MOE funds for services and benefits that directly lead to (or can be expected to lead to) the accomplishment of one of these four purposes. For example, it could fund special initiatives to improve the motivation, performance, and self-esteem of youth (e.g., activities like those included in the HHS Girl Power! Campaign or sponsored by the Boys and Girls Clubs) because such initiatives would be expected to reduce school-dropout and teen pregnancy rates.”

In addition to after-school programs, Missouri's TANF expenditures have supported in-school initiatives that support positive youth outcomes. For example, the Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) program gives students in selected at-risk areas the tools needed to make a successful transition to post-secondary education and meaningful employment with self-sustaining wages to decrease the need for government assistance.

The proposed rule would not only impact general youth programs, but also a state's ability to provide employment services to teens and older youth who are not yet parents. ACF-IM-2012-01 speaks to the importance of programming that supports youth employment and reminds states that “. . . a jurisdiction may use TANF and/or MOE funds to serve youth up through the age of 24 in a subsidized employment program under TANF statutory purpose one,” and that TANF funds may be used whether or not the youth resides in the home of a parent or relative. Furthermore, the same memorandum speaks to other allowable activities that support youth in summer jobs programs, including education and training, supportive services, transportation for employed persons for the purpose of attending work or training, counseling and employment related services, and incentive payments that reward the participant for achieving a predetermined milestone.

Similarly, the NPRM calls into question the funding of college scholarships for childless older youth as an allowable TANF expenditure. Studies have indicated that higher educational attainment typically translates into a reduced likelihood of out-of-wedlock pregnancy and increases the chances the individual will become a supportive member of a two-parent household. These facts support both TANF Purposes three and four. However, interpretations of this research are subjective, and the uncertainty regarding ACF's acceptance of supporting evidence places a significant risk on states like Missouri that utilize TANF funds for scholarships. At a minimum, we contend these expenditures should be allowable for youth and young adults with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

After 25 years of guidance that reinforces that after-school and other programs targeting youth and young adults meet a TANF Purpose, the sudden shift to render these programs unallowable is illogical and short sighted. The TANF program was created to help states fund programs that break the cycle of poverty, and serving youth is one of the proven ways of doing so.

Missouri strongly encourages ACF to reconsider the proposed rule and continue to allow states to invest in their youth, which in turn is an investment in the future.

ALLOW PROGRAMS THAT SUPPORT PREGNANT WOMEN AND POSITIVE OUTCOMES FOR THEIR CHILDREN

The NPRM states that—

“Programs that only or primarily provide pregnancy counseling to women only after they become pregnant likely do not meet the reasonable person standard because the connection to preventing and reducing out-of-wedlock pregnancies is tenuous or non-existent, and therefore do not accomplish purpose three.”

Missouri funds programs for pregnant women that 1) set up the unborn/newborn child for success by providing a range of services and supports; and 2) offer resources to the mother that decrease the chances of future unwanted pregnancies. Examples of benefits and services provided through these comprehensive programs include but are not limited to food, clothing and supplies related to pregnancy, newborn care and parenting, housing and utilities, job training and placement, prenatal care and ultrasound services, medical and mental health care, transportation, establishing and promoting responsible paternity, and parenting skills classes.

We contend that these services are allowable under multiple TANF purposes. And we understand that states will have the opportunity to provide research or programmatic evidence that supports these programs' link to a TANF purpose/s. However, these judgments are subjective, and we are concerned that decisions of TANF allowability after funds have been expended place undue risk on state budgets and the comprehensive nature of the programs. Accordingly, programs that support pregnant women and positive outcomes for their children should be clearly allowable and not subject to the reasonable person test.

CONSIDER ALLOWING THIRD PARTY MOE TO COUNT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Uniform administrative requirements that govern TANF explicitly allow third-party spending to count toward a state's Maintenance of Effort spending, and this was codified in the TANF regulations as part of the 2008 Final Rule for the Deficit Reduction Act. The NPRM would continue to allow third party spending from public entities to count as MOE but would prohibit the use of nonprofit spending. This change would severely impact Missouri, and we urge ACF to reconsider.

Missouri has a unique set up with the non-profit agencies that provide MOE toward the state's TANF claim in that the same agencies also receive TANF block grant funding. Missouri has established as matching requirement, whereby the TANF funds received are contingent on the non-profits also providing documented MOE spending. This cost-sharing responsibility has created high quality public-private partnerships, and the state's investment of TANF funds has allowed the non-profits to expand services to low-income families.

Missouri urges ACF to consider allowing third party MOE from non-profit agencies if those dollars are part of a matching requirement for receiving TANF funds. In this way, the non-profit community will be invested in

helping further the purposes of TANF alongside the state.

CONSIDER SLOWING DOWN IMPLEMENTATION TO ALLOW STATES TO ADJUST TO NEW RULES

The NPRM includes several sweeping changes that will have a dramatic impact on how states operate their TANF program. Further it suggests that the rules could be in effect as soon as October 2024, if the rules are enacted in the current fiscal year. This is simply too fast. States are already in the budgeting process for next year, and to have such significant changes in what is allowable for TANF and TANF MOE would be detrimental to states.

States need time to educate legislators on the changes in what programs can and cannot be funded with TANF; in some cases, they need to unlearn rules that have been in place since the inception of TANF. Furthermore, states need time to adjust contracts and spending plans.

Previous proposed changes to the TANF program that were introduced in Congress would have included a phased-in approach to changes. Missouri urges ACF to consider something similar, with the changes in allowability and third-party MOE going into effect over the course of three to five years. For example, ACF could allow states that currently claim third party MOE to establish a baseline, then allow them to claim 75 percent 50 percent, and 25 percent of that amount over the next three years. This would allow states to adjust spending over the course of several years, rather than leaving states at risk of missing MOE requirements and losing federal TANF dollars through a penalty process.

The proposed rules would be the most sweeping change to the TANF program since its inception in 1996. To have these changes all take place at the same time and with very little lead time creates an undue burden on the states. Missouri DSS strongly encourages ACF to reconsider these changes.

Our partners and providers have expressed many of the same concerns we have noted above. Please see the attached twenty-two (22) letters from stakeholders across the state who would be impacted by these changes.

We appreciate your consideration of the submitted comments and suggestions and look forward to working together to strengthen TANF and to strengthen and support the families that we serve.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. KNODELL,
Director.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at least four other States—Indiana, Louisiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—provide TANF funding to pregnancy resource centers, which meets the TANF purposes of assisting needy families and reducing dependence on government.

As Missouri's comment letter states, it is imperative that we protect this funding and the vital services pregnancy resource centers provide for our families and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when *Roe v. Wade* was overturned, people were scared. They feared for the future of their rights and ability to make deeply personal decisions about their own bodies. I have heard from many

people who are concerned that their children and grandchildren might grow up with less rights than they had.

In August 2022, Kansans made their voices overwhelmingly clear: Politics and politicians have no place in the middle of healthcare decisions. Those decisions are between a person and their doctor alone.

However, despite the resounding messages delivered by Kansans and other States, extremists persist in their relentless effort to deprive Americans of their fundamental right to choose.

Sadly, that is where we find ourselves today, where certain Members of this body are attempting to push legislation that would directly limit access to the full range of reproductive care.

This bill blatantly misleads the American people, diverting funds meant for food, rent, and childcare to certain harmful facilities that purposely provide disinformation to people seeking access to care. I won't stand for it, and neither will Kansans.

We should be expanding access to healthcare, including reproductive healthcare, rather than masking misinformation behind dishonest policies that actually endanger a person's health. Even further, we should be upfront with the American people. Isn't that the bare minimum?

Let me be clear: The right to choose is fundamental. Working to strip that right should never be a priority, especially days before a possible government shutdown that would have devastating impacts on hardworking families.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to stand with me in delivering a powerful message, one that the American people absolutely need to hear: Your ability to decide what is best for you, your body, your family, and your future is inherently your choice, now and always.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment that would ensure that taxpayer dollars cannot be allocated to pregnancy centers that provide medically inaccurate information and put the health of a woman at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment and hope that my colleagues will join me in voting "yes" on this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, tens of thousands of pro-life Americans will converge on The National Mall for the March for Life on the anniversary of the Supreme Court's 1973 *Roe v. Wade* ruling, which legalized abortion in all 50 States.

Today's legislation will ensure that expectant mothers will have access to alternatives to abortion and choose the

life-affirming services provided at pregnancy resource centers.

I include in the RECORD letters of support from the National Right to Life Committee and CatholicVote and a statement of support from Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE,
Alexandria, VA, January 17, 2024.

Re Scorecard Advisory, H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) urges you to support H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act. NRLC intends to include the roll call on H.R. 6918 in its scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 118th Congress.

This legislation would ensure that pregnancy centers are eligible for state-directed federal funds through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Pregnancy centers serve millions of clients annually and offer hope and support for women and their unborn children. In a post-Roe America, it is more important now than ever that pregnancy centers can effectively support mothers and their babies.

The Biden Administration is currently proposing a rule to restrict federal funds from going to pregnancy centers in a number of states that direct funds to them through the TANF program. H.R. 6918 would prohibit HHS from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing this or any similar rulemaking that would restrict use of TANF for pregnancy centers.

National Right to Life and several affected states submitted official comments in opposition to the proposed Biden rule, "Strengthening Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) as a Safety Net and Work Program," published on October 2, 2023 (the "Proposed Rule"). The Proposed Rule, among other things, targets pregnancy resource centers by threatening to strip them of millions of dollars of funding claiming, without evidence, that pregnancy centers do not meet TANF criteria. This is funding that is currently being used to compassionately help women and their unborn babies.

Nearly 3,000 pregnancy centers serve about 2 million clients annually, saving local communities millions of dollars by providing services at little to no cost. Many pregnancy centers provide limited obstetrical ultrasounds under a local doctor's oversight as well as parenting classes. In addition, nearly all centers provide material assistance such as diapers, cribs, and car seats as well as practical help such as connecting a mother in need to local resources that can help her with housing or transportation.

For the above reasons, the National Right to Life Committee urges you to support H.R. 6918. NRLC intends to include the roll call on H.R. 6918 in its scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 118th Congress.

Sincerely

CAROL TOBIAS,
President.
SCOTT FISCHBACH,
Executive Director.
JENNIFER POPIK, J.D.,
Legislative Director.

JANUARY 15, 2024.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of CatholicVote, representing the voices of millions of Catholics across America who seek to renew our country and our culture, I am writing to voice our support for H.R. 6914, "The Pregnant Students' Rights Act" and H.R. 6918, "Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act."

Women who choose life of their children, and the private organizations that support them, are under unprecedented attack by those who think abortion is the only answer. Unfortunately, this pro-death approach is endorsed by both the Biden administration as well as the Democratic Party. The result is that women who find themselves in situations they did not prepare for falsely believe they are alone and that the only way out is the death of their unborn child.

H.R. 6914, introduced by Rep. Ashley Hinson, R-IA, would amend the Higher Education Act to require higher education institutions to distribute information about the rights of pregnant students and the resources available to them at the school, via their website, student handbooks, emails, and during student orientations. The bill also reinforces current law requiring schools to adopt and publish procedures for students to file complaints of discrimination related to their sex, pregnancy, or parental status by imploring colleges to make these existing protections and accommodations more widely known.

H.R. 6918, introduced by Rep. Michelle Fischbach, R-MN, would block a Biden Administration rule that could prohibit states from giving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds to pregnancy centers which support the life of both the mother and unborn child.

Currently there have been hundred of physical attacks on pregnancy resource centers. It is no surprise that the Biden administration would tacitly endorse those attacks by attempting to divert resources away from these lifesaving and life affirming entities. Joe Biden would prefer to make it harder for moms to choose life for their unborn child and take care of themselves and their baby. If this rule takes effect, women in America will have fewer alternatives to abortion and less access to maternal care.

The passage of these bills should not be controversial; however, the extremism of the Democratic Party has made it clear that if you are a young mother who chooses life they will make it harder for you to prosper. CatholicVote will score in favor of both H.R. 6914, "The Pregnant Students' Rights Act" and H.R. 6918, "Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act" in our annual scorecard for the 118th Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS MCCLUSKY,
Director of Government Affairs,
CatholicVote.

HOUSE COMMITTEE VOTES TO PROTECT PREGNANCY RESOURCE CENTERS FROM DISCRIMINATION—SBA PRO-LIFE AMERICA

(By Mary Owens, January 11, 2024)

Today, the U.S. House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee passed the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, legislation to ensure that pregnancy centers cannot be discriminated against from receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding. The House is expected to vote on the bill as early as next week.

This bill is in response to the Biden administration's proposed Health and Human Services (HHS) rule that discriminates against life-affirming non-profits. If the rule goes into effect, it could render pregnancy centers ineligible for this funding. In December, SBA Pro-Life America and the Charlotte Lozier Institute submitted a public comment pointing out how the rule is unfair and inaccurate.

The national pro-life group SBA Pro-Life America celebrated the committee's work in a statement:

The Biden administration is working overtime to prove they are not pro-choice, but

pro-abortion by proposing this discriminatory rule and ignoring the majority of Americans who support public funding of pregnancy resource centers," said the Honorable Marilyn Musgrave, SBA Pro-Life America's vice president of government affairs. "The nearly 3,000 pregnancy resource centers nationwide provide women with medical, material and emotional support for themselves and their families. We are grateful to the committee for passing this bill that prevents discrimination against centers and protects their ability to continue receiving TANF funds to help moms and families.

Thank you to Chairman Jason Smith and Representatives Michelle Fischbach, Claudia Tenney and Smith for championing this important legislation and getting it through committee. We urge the House to pass this commonsense legislation."

The proposed rule is the latest in a string of political attacks on life-affirming organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will all celebrate life and support pregnant and parenting women and families.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We keep hearing about how these centers provide infant formula, and we have a program that helps mothers afford infant formula. It is called WIC.

I remind my colleagues that House Republicans' fiscal year 2024 Agriculture appropriations bill would have made benefit cuts and eligibility losses for millions of mothers who rely on WIC. It would have shortchanged WIC by \$800 million.

So, I find the argument that the centers are so necessary to be specious because that could have been provided under the Agriculture appropriations bill, which my Republican colleagues wanted to cut so dramatically. If they really cared about working families, they wouldn't be asking for those deep and unconscionable cuts to a program that provides infant formula to mothers.

□ 1315

As we have seen over the past hour, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are choosing to double down on their war on women. These centers have coerced, deceived, and put women's lives in danger with inaccurate, biased information, but don't just take my word for it. A congressional investigation found that the majority of these clinics surveyed provided false information about abortion. The American Medical Association has called these centers unethical because of the gross disinformation that they push on vulnerable women.

These centers are not regulated by State's consumer protection statutes which govern the practice of medicine. Republicans have proven they have no

interest in amending this bill to actually protect pregnant women seeking care from these facilities.

My Ways and Means Republican colleagues voted against ensuring these facilities provide medically accurate information.

Why are they so afraid to provide women with medically accurate information?

My Republican colleagues voted against prohibiting these facilities from providing biased reproductive health information or counseling.

Let me be very clear. Democrats have fought, and we continue to fight, for comprehensive equitable access to reproductive healthcare for women.

We passed the Women's Health Protection Act twice.

We passed the right to contraception.

The American people have been very clear about supporting access to reproductive healthcare. Democrats have proven that we stand with them, and this bill that the Republicans have put on the floor today once again shows that my Republican colleagues are willing to discard pregnant women to appease their extremist anti-choice rightwing base.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. Pregnancy resource centers are an important option for pregnant women seeking care. They provide critical services to support the health of mothers and their unborn children, including providing needed resources, like diapers, prenatal vitamins, transportation, and parenting classes.

It is unacceptable that the Biden administration proposes to take this option away from mothers and to restrict their access to healthcare.

The administration does not have authority under TANF to restrict funds for pregnancy resource centers. What is worse is that the administration is doing this in order to send more taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood. This Congress must act on behalf of mothers and the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6918, the so called Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

This bill would achieve the exact opposite of its purported goal of supporting parenting women and families—instead, it would divert funding away from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, or TANF. TANF provides cash assistance directly to struggling families with children to pay for essential needs. Hypocritically, this extreme GOP bill would siphon off funding intended for our neediest families to prop up a network of uncensored, unregulated Crisis Pregnancy Centers run by anti-choice activists.

If the GOP was truly the "pro-life" party, they would know that TANF is the only federal assistance program that struggling families can use to buy diapers for their babies. Families who receive direct cash assistance

through TANF can purchase diapers for their children at their nearest store. Some of my Republican colleagues have argued that many Crisis Pregnancy Centers provide diapers for families. However, if parents had to instead rely on Crisis Pregnancy Centers for essential childcare needs, they could be forced to travel long distances to centers that might not be accessible through public transportation. Additionally, an investigation by this very body found that 87% of anti-abortion counseling centers provide false or misleading information about reproductive care.

If the GOP was in touch with the needs of their constituents, they would know that diaper need is a crisis in America that can overwhelm families who are already financially struggling. An average monthly supply of diapers for a single child costs \$80 to \$100. As of 2023, half of U.S. families report not being able to afford enough diapers to keep their child clean, dry, and healthy, and 3 in 5 parents report missing work or school because they can't afford the diapers required to leave their baby in childcare. Tell me, how is taking away the only federal funding for diapers pro-life?

I strongly oppose this farce of a bill that would only harm struggling families.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak in strong opposition to the proposed legislation, H.R. 6918—Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

This legislation, in my view, represents a concerning step in the wrong direction.

It has been characterized by critics as part of a broader effort by conservative Republicans to limit women's reproductive freedom.

With nearly 18 months having passed since the pivotal *Roe v. Wade* decision was overturned, the introduction of this bill signals a continued push towards what some view as a national ban on abortion.

I believe that reproductive rights are a fundamental aspect of individual autonomy, and any legislative measures that may restrict or impede these rights warrant scrutiny.

Furthermore, the potential allocation of federal funds to support such measures raises serious concerns about the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars and the role of government in personal healthcare decisions.

I am committed to advocating for policies that uphold and protect the reproductive rights of individuals, recognizing the importance of a balanced and inclusive approach that respects diverse perspectives.

This legislation seeks to undermine a woman's right to access abortion services by employing tactics that involve misleading information, deceptive practices, and attempts at shaming individuals seeking reproductive care.

We as Democrats, in response, remain steadfast in our commitment to enshrine reproductive freedom as a legal right through the Women's Health Protection Act (H.R. 12).

This comprehensive legislation aims to safeguard individuals' access to essential reproductive healthcare services and protect them from deceptive practices that may obstruct their right to make informed choices about their reproductive health.

We must advocate for a legislative approach that prioritizes the autonomy and well-being of individuals seeking reproductive care while countering efforts to curtail their rights through disinformation and coercion.

In addition, H.R. 6918 raises significant concerns as it proposes funding for what are com-

monly referred to as "crisis pregnancy centers" or anti-abortion centers (AACs).

These entities have been criticized for engaging in deceptive practices that aim to manipulate women during their pregnancies, potentially hindering their ability to access comprehensive reproductive care.

In light of these considerations, I firmly oppose H.R. 6918 and will work to ensure that the legislative process reflects a careful examination of its potential impact on the rights and choices of individuals.

In my home state of Texas where abortion have been completely banned, our state has continued to struggle with maternal mortality and morbidity, and the rates are only expected to increase as the years go by.

In 2013, when Texas first started tracking deaths and severe illness or injury from pregnancy and childbirth, Black women were twice as likely as white women and four times as likely as Hispanic women to die from pregnancy-related causes.

This number has only increased as more women are being denied lifesaving abortion measures and face inadequate care after birth.

Another undermining aspect of this bill is in its use of TANF, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

TANF plays a crucial role as it is a vital resource for families across the country.

This bill, however, introduces a concerning element by potentially creating a loophole that could divert essential funding away from its intended purpose, channeling it toward anti-abortion crisis pregnancy centers.

These centers have faced scrutiny for their practices, with critics arguing that they may engage in deceptive tactics, potentially impacting the comprehensive support available to families.

By allowing TANF funding to be redirected to such centers, there is a risk that the intended assistance for struggling families may be compromised.

TANF's importance cannot be underestimated as it provides financial support, job preparation, and other essential services to low-income families.

The proposed diversion of funds to anti-abortion crisis pregnancy centers raises questions about the broader impact on the social safety net and the potential limitations it might place on the availability of diverse and comprehensive resources for those in need.

As discussions on this bill unfold, it is crucial to assess how any changes may affect the original objectives of TANF and the families it is designed to support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 969, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6918 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The material previously referred to by Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas is as follows:

Ms. Davids of Kansas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6918 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. __. LIMITATION.

Section 2 shall not take effect unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services finds that there is no pregnancy center (as defined in section 2) that provides medically inaccurate or deceptive information or puts at risk the health of women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PREGNANT STUDENTS' RIGHTS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 969, I call up the bill (H.R. 6914) to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 969, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6914

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pregnant Students' Rights Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Female students enrolled at institutions of higher education and experiencing an unplanned pregnancy may face pressure that their only option is to receive an abortion or risk academic failure.

(2) Almost 30 percent of all abortions in the United States are performed on women of college age, between the ages of 20 and 24, according to a 2021 report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(3) Scientific evidence and personal testimonies document that women who have abortions can be at risk of mental health issues. Studies show that after an abortion, women are 34 percent more likely to develop anxiety disorders, 37 percent more likely to develop depression, 110 percent more likely to rely on alcohol

use or abuse, 115 percent more likely to develop suicidal behavior, and 220 percent more likely to take on marijuana use or abuse. As many as 60 percent of women having an abortion experience some level of emotional distress afterwards, with 30 percent being classified as severe distress. Potential complications of abortions include heavy or persistent bleeding, damage to cervix, abdominal pain or cramping, scarring of uterine lining, breast cancer, future premature births or miscarriages, infection or sepsis, placenta previa, perforation of uterus, damage to other organs, and even death.

(4) A significant proportion of abortions in the United States are performed on women of college age who may be unaware of their rights to accommodation and prohibitions against discrimination due to pregnancy under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) or deprived of information about abortion alternatives.

(5) Additionally, women on college campuses may fear institutional reprisal, loss of athletic scholarship, and possible negative impact on academic opportunities during the pregnancy and after childbirth.

(6) An academic disparity exists because of the lack of resources, support, and notifications available for female college students who do not wish to receive an abortion or who carry their unborn babies to term.

SEC. 3. NOTICE OF PREGNANT STUDENT RIGHTS, ACCOMMODATIONS, AND RESOURCES.

Section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) PREGNANT STUDENTS’ RIGHTS, ACCOMMODATIONS, AND RESOURCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each institution of higher education participating in any program under this title shall carry out the information dissemination activities described in paragraph (3) for prospective and enrolled students (including those attending or planning to attend less than full time) regarding the information described in paragraph (2) on the rights to, and resources (including protections and accommodations) for, pregnant students to carry a baby to term and students who may become pregnant while enrolled at such institution of higher education to carry a baby to term.

“(2) INFORMATION CONTENT.—The information described in this paragraph is the following:

“(A) A list of resources on campus and in the community that exist to help a pregnant student in carrying the baby to term and caring for the baby after birth.

“(B) Information about the accommodations available to help a pregnant student carry the baby to term and parent the baby after birth.

“(C) Information on how to file a complaint with—

“(i) the Department of Education, if a student believes there was a violation by the institution of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) on account of such student’s determination to carry a baby to term; and

“(ii) the institution, if a student believes the student has been discriminated against in violation of such title IX on account of the student’s determination to carry a baby to term.

“(3) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES.—The information dissemination activities described in this paragraph shall include—

“(A) an email to each enrolled student at the start of each period of study during an academic year; and

“(B) the provision of information—

“(i) in student handbooks, if any;

“(ii) at each orientation for enrolled students;

“(iii) at student health or counseling centers, if any; and

“(iv) on the publicly available website of the institution of higher education.

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the

Secretary to require the dissemination of additional information, or establish additional rights, beyond the information and rights included in this subsection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6914.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise as a mother, a grandmother, and a former college instructor, administrator, and student to support the Pregnant Students’ Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, in debating the tenets of this bill, I keep coming back to the dual mandate that it represents: more educated young women and more healthy babies carried to term.

It reminds me of the two great sources of hope and joy in my personal life, the first of which is education.

I have dedicated my life to helping others get a good education, as I was able to do. A good education is a major element of a good life.

The second great source of hope and joy in my life has been to rear a child. Having children and then grandchildren is the highest calling and truly the ultimate blessing.

Pursuing knowledge and having children: These are two virtues that carry immense social value and should be celebrated. I say should, because as is more often the case, modern society holds them in conflict with one another.

Pregnant students should not be faced with the dilemma that their academic and future success must be sacrificed to an unplanned pregnancy.

Data show carrying a child to term does not have to hinder one’s educational journey. As a woman who understands the strength and resilience of other women, I found it unsurprising that student mothers outperformed their childless peers in the classroom.

It is a long-held belief that pregnancy should never be a barrier to a student completing her education. It is a belief enshrined in Title IX, which establishes that universities receiving Federal funds must provide equal opportunities for all students, regardless of pregnancy or parental status.

In order to receive Federal funding, campus classroom and education-re-

lated activities, from athletics to scholarships to lab work and more, must allow protections and accommodations for pregnant women. That means coaches cannot remove players, universities cannot revoke scholarships, and teachers cannot penalize absences due to medical reasons related to a pregnancy.

Yet, despite the legal equality for pregnant students established under Title IX, a significant challenge persists to informing women of the rights and the resources at their disposal. No expectant mother should be left in the dark.

The Pregnant Students’ Rights Act seeks to bridge the gap between legal protections and practical awareness. It ensures that universities make information regarding pregnant students’ rights and protections accessible through handouts, e-mails, and university websites.

This bill comes at a time when the nontraditional college student is becoming the norm. Over 20 percent of college students are parents, many of whom are single mothers. With more people entering college at every station of life, it is critical that we pass the Pregnant Students’ Rights Act. All students should know the rights and protections available to them, including young, pregnant women.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Pregnant Students’ Rights Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6914, the so-called Pregnant Students’ Rights Act. This legislation requires institutions of higher education to distribute information about some of the rights of and accommodations for pregnant students. I opposed this legislation in committee and do so again today because, among other reasons, what is required in this bill is incomplete and biased by not providing information about comprehensive family planning resources and a full range of reproductive healthcare options for pregnant students.

Additionally, Republican amendments adopted in the committee added controversial misinformation to this bill, including the myth that having an abortion can lead to breast cancer. This claim has been refuted by the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

These scare tactics unmasked the true intention of this bill, which is to further the Republican agenda about attacking reproductive healthcare in their attempt to pass a nationwide ban on abortion.

As I mentioned to my Republican colleagues in committee, if you want to encourage pregnancy and childbirth, join with Democrats in passing legislation that will make childcare more affordable, support access to affordable healthcare and affordable housing, expand the Children’s Health Insurance

Program, and join the rest of the world in offering paid family leave.

The intent of this bill is clear. It is another attempt to have politicians interfere in the very intensely personal decision of whether and when to have a child, a decision that should be made only by the pregnant student and their healthcare provider, not by judges, and certainly not by Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), the sponsor of H.R. 6914.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. FOXX for her leadership in stewarding this bill through committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bill, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act.

When *Roe v. Wade* was rightfully overturned last year, the next chapter of the pro-life movement began, and we were all given a new opportunity to strengthen our support for unborn babies and new moms.

As a mom of two, this issue is personal to me. When you are pregnant, there are a million questions going through your head. From doctors' appointments to new financial responsibilities, pregnant students have so much on their plate as they work to balance school with having a healthy pregnancy.

Unfortunately, many women on college campuses are pressured into having an abortion and told they must choose between having their baby and continuing their education, despite Title IX protections in place.

Under Title IX, pregnant students have the right to stay in school, finish their education, and achieve their career goals. However, academic disparity exists due to the lack of resources, support, and tools for pregnant students.

These women may fear institutional reprisal, a loss of athletic scholarship, or negative impacts on their academic opportunity, and standing.

□ 1330

These fears and anxieties are not only unjust to women, but they are really a poor reflection of how our higher education institutions treat pregnant students. These institutions have a responsibility to empower all of their students to succeed, including pregnant students.

There are many organizations that provide physical and emotional support for new and soon-to-be moms, and pregnant students should know about these resources on college campuses. They deserve to be treated with respect and to be surrounded with care and love.

I have visited pregnancy resource centers in Iowa. I have met with those who have dedicated themselves to the cause of life, many of whom have traveled to Washington, D.C., to the March for Life this weekend.

It has been inspiring to me to see the pro-life community spring into action to help expecting moms and their babies to thrive. That is what this movement is really all about: recognizing the sanctity of every life and valuing life at every stage.

Pregnant students bravely balance the responsibilities of bringing a new life into this world while simultaneously continuing their pursuit of a bright future through education. It is crucial for pregnant students to know that they have people standing behind them, that they have resources available to them, and that they are entitled to accommodations on campus.

Being able to complete your education as a mother is not only empowering for the student, but it is vital to ensuring that the unborn child has the best possible future ahead.

The Pregnant Students' Rights Act amends the Higher Education Act to require education institutions at the higher level to distribute information about the rights of pregnant students and the resources available to them at the school via their student handbooks, via email, websites, and during orientations. It also strengthens procedures for students to be able to file complaints and pursue accountability if their rights to these accommodations are violated.

It is deeply troubling to me that the Biden administration is so dug in on their pro-abortion agenda that they would oppose providing pregnant women on college campuses with resources to continue their education and have a healthy pregnancy. They don't even want them to have this information or know that they have options other than abortion.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will vote to empower pregnant women and support this vital, life-affirming legislation. There is no reason that providing additional resources and support to women who choose life should be partisan. Every woman who chooses to complete her studies through her pregnancy is another American citizen doubly contributing to our families, to our communities, to our workforce, and should be an inspiration to us all.

This bill, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act, is a step in the right direction to creating a culture of life in our society and a step that we must take as we continue to pursue policies that will help our families grow and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly cared about moms, they would join us in addressing the embarrassingly high maternal mortality rate in this country, which is especially concerning for women of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House Republicans' harmful Pregnant Students' Rights Act.

Make no mistake. This legislation does nothing to protect pregnant students and fails to provide young parents with the real tools they need to succeed, including affordable childcare, affordable housing, and so much more.

Masquerading as an attempt to support pregnant students, this misleading bill is a part of Republicans' dangerous anti-abortion agenda. It would require institutions to distribute limited and even inaccurate resources to students about their existing rights should they choose to carry a pregnancy to term, while omitting information about abortion services, contraception, and while also advancing anti-abortion rhetoric.

Last year, I introduced the Understanding Student Parent Outcomes Act with Congresswoman LUCY McBATH. This legislation would take concrete steps to support pregnant and parenting students by requiring the Department of Education to collect critical data on barriers that student parents face to graduating college and providing recommendations and resources to institutions of higher education.

During the committee markup of this egregious bill, Congresswoman McBATH highlighted our bill as an alternative solution that will help student parents succeed while recognizing that all women deserve the opportunity to make their own choices about when to start a family free from persuasion from their schools.

I hope my Republican colleagues will see the harm that their legislation will cause and join Democrats in opposing this bill. There are better ways to help our pregnant and parenting students.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chair of the Values Action Team.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX for the time to speak in support of this legislation today.

This week, a compelling statistic has been front and center of our mind, that 30 percent of all abortions in the United States are performed on 20- to 24-year-old, college-aged women.

You wonder how much of this difficult reality is the result of a harmful external pressure that exists, a lack of resources that may exist, inadequate accommodations, or how often a young woman would have chosen life if she had just been informed of the rights, the resources, and the accommodations that were available to her.

We must create a culture in this country that does not force women to choose between their babies and a college education. This legislation directly addresses this by simply requiring colleges and universities, as has been said here today, to fully inform pregnant students of what is rightfully available to them and how to file a complaint if they have experienced discrimination on the basis of their pregnancy.

It is imperative that our institutions of higher education fully support

women. We can't say it enough. Pro-life is prowoman.

When a student chooses a path of higher education, they deserve our support and encouragement. Being prowoman and being prochild and being profamily is being proeducation and it is being prosuccess.

I thank my colleague from Iowa, who I serve on the Appropriations Committee with, for introducing this important legislation. I fully support it and look forward to its passage today.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deliberately misleading Pregnant Students' Rights Act.

It is unfortunately not a bill about protecting pregnant and parenting students or improving their outcomes in school at all. This legislation is just another poorly disguised attempt to further roll back the rights of women in this country and unduly pressure students into making serious healthcare decisions.

We should be considering legislation that will actually support pregnant and parenting students and has a real chance of being passed into law, like the Understanding Student Parent Outcomes Act of 2023, introduced by my colleague, Representative DEBORAH ROSS, and me.

Instead of leveraging the very real needs of students and their children against the highly polarizing and personal topics of reproductive rights and abortion, we could be studying the issue and establishing best practices at the Department of Education to improve graduation rates and help pregnant and parenting Americans stay in school, practices like ensuring access to quality on-campus childcare and accommodations for breastfeeding.

Supporting pregnant and parenting students should be a bipartisan effort, but the bill that our colleagues have brought forth today does not seek to find commonsense, consensus solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle at the appropriate time to ensure that every student is given the support that they need to finish their degree, improve their career, and finally move into that higher income level that they have been dreaming of and working so hard toward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, whenever this subject gets brought up, it is like we just go into la-la land about what the facts are and what the intentions are.

For a female student that is in college, on campus, she needs options. She needs to understand what her options are. She needs information to do that.

This legislation simply affords a broader amount of information and choices for her to do that.

How the folks on the other side could call this some kind of limitation or somehow against women just continues to foster the disinformation for 40 years about this subject.

Indeed, it is life that we are talking about. For women, we see in some of these cases, as many as 60 percent, they have gone on to have abortions because they believe that is the only option they have. They have been, in some cases, bullied into it, or closed off from other information. Sixty percent would have preferred to give birth had they known they had the security, the options, and maybe not even be discriminated against on campus to do so.

No, the left is always concerned about having the maximum number of abortions. It is appalling.

Students that are pregnant deserve support and dignity and the options that help them fulfill whatever their goals are going to be, whatever their life course is going to be. That isn't done by hiding information and hiding options from them. We know the trauma that women can feel when they only have that one option, and it is very real.

This bill is a simple step toward that support and helps keep more mothers on their desired path while still pursuing their college degree and getting a career. It is an important part of improving their life and their outlook.

It is unbelievable to me the rhetoric that is used to go up against these young women having options and having information.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in committee, a pregnant student is not just the only one affected. If whomever impregnated the student got some rights and notification about paternity and child support obligations, that might help this information be more complete, but that is not in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding the time.

Outrageous in its meaning and egregious in its outcome, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act.

The amendment that I proposed in committee, the amendment that I took before the Rules Committee, to say that this bill should not fail in recognizing miscarriage, was not accepted, yet we know that upward of a quarter of pregnancies result in miscarriage.

If you are not privileged to be going to college in Michigan, a State where abortion rights are enshrined into our State Constitution and are protected, and you are having a miscarriage, what happens to you? You are turned away at a hospital, and you are turned away for medical care.

I rise today in support of women's healthcare rights, of women's freedom.

Let's talk about pregnant rights, because we see in the States across this country, after *Roe v. Wade* was overturned, that women cannot get the healthcare they need. We see reporting in everyday publications like *People* magazine about women bleeding out in parking lots and women being forced to travel in their time of medical emergency on airplanes to get the care they need. That is what my colleagues are talking about.

Yes, there is the miracle of life, but there is a need for real healthcare. Here we are at the quarter of the 21st century mark in this great country, we have access to all of the medical information we need to support the unborn, to support women, and to make sure that we have the best health outcomes, yet we have rising maternal mortality and a Black maternal mortality crisis in this country.

□ 1345

How dare we come together under the guise of supporting pregnant students' rights without actually including full access to information to young women in their most vulnerable state? That is what we were pushing for in the Education and Labor Committee. That is what we were pushing for here on the House floor on the heels of voting on this resolution almost in the dark of the night. We have work to do.

I am proud to be in a State that protects women's rights, but, man, oh, man, am I terrified, am I heartbroken for women that don't have those rights.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly puzzled by the other side and some of the comments that are being made about this bill. It is a simple bill. It is not misleading. It is simply aimed at helping pregnant students get the support and information that they need if they are pursuing their education.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle used to be pro-women. I don't know what has happened to them, but, as one of my colleagues here said, pro-life is pro-woman. This bill is pro-women and pro-helping women getting an education. At the same time, they can carry their baby to term.

Now, nothing in this bill prevents a college or university from disseminating information about how to deal with pregnancy-related conditions, including miscarriages. We are not telling the colleges and universities everything that they have to say. We are simply saying you have to inform the students of the services available and the accommodations that need to be made.

All of us should have our hearts go out to women who face difficult pregnancies. We have all known them. My own daughter had four very difficult pregnancies.

I am deeply saddened that a woman and her baby face challenges and acknowledge that, for a pregnant student, these instances must be extremely stressful and sorrowful, but the purpose of this legislation is to tackle an issue unique to pregnant students on college campuses.

Some students are not aware of how they can advocate for themselves to balance student life and motherhood. Colleges and universities must provide reasonable accommodations for these students, such as excused absences and opportunities to make up classwork when a student does have to make frequent medical appointments to take care of herself and her baby.

This bill supports pregnant students, and I believe it deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected an amendment to include information about comprehensive reproductive healthcare services.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the dynamic, distinguished, and dedicated Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the great State of Oregon, Representative BONAMICI, for her tremendous advocacy and for yielding some time.

I rise today in strong opposition to this reckless and regressive Republican effort to undermine women's healthcare.

House Republicans have begun this year the same way that they ended last year, targeting women's reproductive freedom. The distinction between Democrats and extreme MAGA Republicans on the abortion care issue couldn't be any clearer. House Democrats believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions. It is a decision that should be between a woman, her family, and her doctors, not extreme MAGA Republicans trying to intervene and indoctrinate and influence young women on college campuses all across America.

We believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions. What House Republicans want to do is to criminalize abortion care. House Republicans want to impose a nationwide abortion ban. House Republicans want to undermine reproductive freedom, and that is what the underlying bill that is on the floor right now is all about—nothing more, and nothing less.

If the legislation that is under consideration was really about improving the opportunity for the children, the infants, the babies of America to live a healthy life, then extreme MAGA Republicans would join Democrats in our efforts to bring that about. House Democrats are trying to address the challenges around infant mortality in

America. Extreme MAGA Republicans refuse to join us.

House Republicans could be working to deal with the challenges around child poverty in America, but they refuse to join House Democrats in our efforts to go back to the transformative child tax credit that was part of the 2021 American Rescue Plan.

House Democrats are working to deal with the problem of child hunger in America, but extreme MAGA Republicans are trying to cut nutritional assistance for children and families in our great country.

How dare the Republicans come to the House floor to lecture America about healthy infants, healthy babies, healthy children, when they are doing everything in their power to do exactly the opposite.

The notion that this bill has anything to do with transparency and providing information to young women on college campuses all across America is undermined by the fact that the Democratic amendments that were offered to provide a comprehensive set of information to women were consistently rejected.

Extreme MAGA Republicans rejected any effort to make sure that young women on college campuses were provided information about the full range of reproductive healthcare. Extreme MAGA Republicans rejected the effort to provide the young women of America with information about the dangers of a miscarriage. Extreme MAGA Republicans rejected the efforts by House Democrats to make sure that the young women of America were provided information about contraceptives. Why? Because House Republicans have only one objective—a nationwide abortion ban.

This legislation is part of that effort, and that is why, instead of the Congress dealing with issues related to the economy or housing or inflation or public safety or healthcare, House Republicans have us voting on bills to undermine a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions.

I strongly urge everyone to reject this extreme piece of legislation and join us in trying to uplift women, children, and families in America.

Our promise to the country is as follows: House Democrats will stand strongly behind reproductive freedom today; we will stand strongly behind reproductive freedom tomorrow; we will stand strongly behind a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions forever until we crush the extreme MAGA Republican effort to criminalize abortion care.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am aghast. I am just aghast at how this bill is being characterized. It is being called an extreme piece of legislation.

We want pregnant students to be supported on their campuses and to know that they can be supported. It has

nothing to do with criminalizing abortions. It has nothing to do with a nationwide abortion ban.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said something about healthy babies. We need pregnant women to have good resources and good healthcare so they can have healthy babies, but they want what they call comprehensive information to women.

What they mean is they want to encourage women to have abortions. And what is an abortion, Mr. Speaker? It is killing babies.

I have said it on the floor before. The word "abortion" sounds so clinical, so clean, but we need to say what it is. It is killing babies up to the point of their birth.

This is not an extreme piece of legislation. It is a sensible piece of legislation, and every person in this body should vote for it if you care about life. If you don't care about life, if all you want to do is destroy life, then vote "no."

That is the radical side. We are not the radical people. We know we have a culture of life. We have had a culture of life in this country. I fear it is eroding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves the support of every person, particularly every woman, because we all can appreciate what it would be like to be in this situation and not have support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are just a few days from what would have been the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, so it is sadly predictable that we are here debating a MAGA Republicans' bill that would stigmatize students who parent while in school or who seek abortion care.

Now, I can't help but chuckle at the ridiculous arguments coming from the other side of the aisle, because, while I will admit that my Republican colleagues are good at naming bills, they are not good at caring for parents or kids after they are born.

□ 1400

This so-called Pregnant Students' Rights Act ironically fails to give pregnant students any new rights. It gives them no meaningful information and support like campus childcare, family housing, or nutrition support if they choose to be pregnant or parent while in school.

Instead, it provides a biased slate of options that pushes students to keep their pregnancy and raise a child, with no mention of contraception or that seeking an abortion is a viable and valid choice.

Pregnant and parenting students deserve comprehensive information about their rights and the resources and support they need to thrive at school. What they don't need are lectures about their choices. They don't need

obstacles to accessing abortion and the full spectrum of healthcare. They certainly don't need this condescending legislation that is more interested in advancing an anti-abortion agenda than genuinely helping students.

The decisions about keeping pregnancy to term and raising a child are serious, private, and personal. Women denied an abortion are four times more likely to live below the Federal poverty line. They are more likely to be evicted, go bankrupt, or have debt. They are more likely to stay in contact with a violent partner and raise the resulting child alone. Their children's financial well-being and development are more likely to suffer, too.

We shouldn't deprive students of making these informed decisions by withholding their full, comprehensive options. This bill does a disservice to pregnant and parenting students.

Instead, we should focus on strengthening Title IX protections, expanding support systems for families on campus like the CCAMPIS program that has been so successful at UC San Diego, and protecting pregnant students from discrimination.

I have to say that I have been in college more recently than just about anyone here, and I don't remember a single person being pressured into having an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), who is a subcommittee chairman for the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding. I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks that the gentlewoman so passionately and effectively espoused just a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pregnant Students' Rights Act. It is incredible and revealing when we hear the other side's reaction to this legislation. This legislation simply requires colleges and universities to share information with mothers about the rights and resources available to help carry their babies to term.

Why would anyone—why would even a Democrat—oppose giving mothers information about the rights and resources available to them? It is because they have become the party of abortion. They have become the party of death.

I am old enough to remember when "safe, legal, and rare" used to be what many Democrats would say. There were many pro-life Democrats not that long ago. Even our President used to claim to be a pro-life Democrat.

We know that when a woman has support, she is better able to raise a child that will enrich her life beyond how she could ever imagine. Nevertheless, we know that many college-aged women are presented with only the option of abortion if the pregnancy was unplanned.

A mother may face pressure from the pro-death abortion industry, otherwise known as the Democratic Party, forcing her to decide between ending the child's life or reaching her academic and professional goals. We know that this is a false choice that disguises the lasting consequences of abortion both for the mother and for the child.

This legislation does include important data on the negative impacts that abortion has on the mother's mental and physical health. Here is the truth: Abortion is harmful to babies and to mothers.

As the bill explains, women who receive abortions are 34 percent more likely to develop anxiety disorders, 37 percent more likely to develop depression, and 115 percent more likely to develop suicidal behavior. The data proves that the mission of the overall bill to support mothers matters not only for the sake of the child but also for the well-being of the mother.

Mothers in challenging situations deserve our compassion, support, and encouragement. Women who have chosen to have an abortion should know there is compassion, support, and healing available to them, as well.

This very week, thousands of people from around the country are gathering in support of life and ending the heinous practice of abortion.

The fact is, life begins at conception. That is the moment when we are, as the Bible says, knit together in our mother's womb by our creator.

I will vote "yes" today on the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and hope this Congress will be bold in finding more ways to defend innocent, precious life in the womb.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, if the technology existed, I really and truly believe the GOP would put tethers on the ovaries of women around our country as a result of this type of overreach and control.

This bill literally would target and bully our daughters on college campuses.

If this bill claims to support our daughters, then let's talk about programs that truly support our daughters. Lifesaving programs that help women after a baby has been born are getting cut left and right. The legislation creates no new rights and no protections under Title IX, no protections from discrimination or information on how to file a Federal civil rights claim.

Literally, the only requirement is that our daughters on college campuses be targeted and shamed. That is exactly what it is.

This is all while the Republican majority does nothing—nothing—to stop the unbelievable crisis we have with infant mortality, Black maternal health, and so much more. We have to beg to fund WIC in this Chamber. WIC specifically supports pregnant women.

Women are already being forced to work harder just to make ends meet

and put food on the table for their families. Yet again, though, we are going to target them. We are going to sit there and pretend that this is to help them.

I represent, Madam Speaker, some communities struggling the most. So many of those struggling are mothers. One came to my office in tears because the early childhood program in her neighborhood was cut. She said that was the place where her children could get fed twice a day.

This is what we have become. We want to bully and shame women in our country. I am proud to support the women in our country, and I am going to be so proud to be able to vote "no" on this extreme, antiwomen legislation.

Let's not gaslight the American people. We know exactly what the GOP is trying to do. They are trying to control us, and it is not going to happen.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 15½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is hard for me to believe that some of our colleagues have read this bill with the comments that they are making. It is a 5-page bill, basically. Maybe it takes up 7 pages, but that is mostly blank space.

There is nothing about overreach and control in this bill. Our colleagues are saying: Well, you don't provide healthcare. You don't provide food stamps. You don't provide other things.

Let me remind my colleagues that we are the Education and the Workforce Committee. We are in our lane. We are looking after pregnant students. Our job is to deal with education issues.

As I said in the Rules Committee, our colleagues can go to other committees to do these things. We are doing what we should be doing, which is, again, staying in our lane and helping pregnant students. They should know that if they are here as Members of Congress.

I wholeheartedly reject, also, the claim that this bill rolls back any rights of women. Nor does it put undue pressure on anyone other than college administrators to ensure that students are fully informed of their rights.

The Pregnant Students' Rights Act ensures that colleges and universities provide information about the rights and accommodations a college must directly offer a mother as she navigates pregnancy and being a parent to her child. Pregnant students deserve equal access to continue their postsecondary education.

I do not understand how connecting a student with information is an attack on any rights. Instead, this bill would decrease the likelihood that a student

is unaware of her opportunities, unlike today, where students may not receive consistent and timely information.

Nowhere in this bill does it prohibit colleges from disseminating any type of information. Nowhere in this bill does it dictate that the information be one-sided.

Since when did it become popular to attack providing information and resources to a mother for taking care of her baby?

Now, let's talk about one-sidedness, which our colleagues are saying. Colleges have been extremely public in support of abortion. Within minutes of the Supreme Court's decision on *Roe v. Wade*, "one-sided" press releases were published as if the issue had to do with higher education.

Here is the statement of the University of Michigan president: "I strongly support . . . abortion services, and I will do everything in my power as president to ensure we continue to provide this critically important care."

That is one shining example of the overt bias coming straight from the top of the university. I don't think anyone can make the claim that universities are not already pushing a one-sided agenda. However, this bill does not tie the hands of colleges from continuing to relay information, but it sure does ensure the student mothers are supported.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, it is clear from the debate on the bill that what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to happen is for every pregnant student to stay pregnant with consequences long beyond their time in college. That is why it is so important that we fund WIC, healthcare, childcare, and all the other things that are prowomen, prochildren, and profamily. This bill is not.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Pregnant Students' Rights Act, which fails to expand meaningful support and accommodations for students.

As a pregnant and parent college student, I have personal experience when it comes to this topic. When I was 19 and in college, I became pregnant with my first daughter and, shortly after, my son.

I know the challenges of navigating the education system while balancing motherhood responsibilities. I know how isolating it can be. I know how critical it is for students to have comprehensive information about their choices, options, resources, and accommodations.

That is why, when I was in the Minnesota State Legislature, I introduced and passed a bill that not only required institutions to provide pregnant and parent students information about their rights and resources for prenatal and postnatal care but also created a

grant program to fund activities that support enrollment, retention, academic success, and graduation.

H.R. 6914 is a do-nothing, empty messaging bill that masquerades to support pregnant and parent students but neglects their actual needs.

Based on my own experience as a young mom in college and the available data, I know that pregnant and parent students need strong Title IX protections; access to affordable childcare, early education, and pre-K services; expansion of student-parent programs, child-friendly study rooms, and lactation accommodations; assistance with basic needs, such as food, housing, transportation, and supplies to ensure that these students and their families have the support they need to thrive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. OMAR. That is why I plan on introducing a bill that not only requires institutions to provide pregnant and parent students with comprehensive information on all the options and resources available to them but also increases the resources and accommodations that are necessary for student success. I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle will help support that bill and reject the current bill that we are voting on.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, so now I am truly confused. Our colleagues have come up one after the other and said that this bill is going to bring the end of the world for the ability for women to gain an abortion, which means killing their babies, and now we are told that this bill does nothing and is a do-nothing bill.

If it is a do-nothing bill, then I certainly hope our colleagues will vote for it because I know they have voted for other do-nothing bills on the floor. Maybe they should think of it as a do-nothing bill and all vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 6914, the reproductive misinformation in higher education act.

Just days before the anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* decision, this legislation is the latest in extreme MAGA Republicans' assault on comprehensive reproductive healthcare services in America, including abortion.

Abortion is healthcare, and we must ensure that everyone who needs it has access to the full range of reproductive healthcare services they deserve.

Let me say that again for the people in the back: Abortion is healthcare, and Americans have been clear that they want reproductive freedom for all.

Yet, the Republican majority continues to spend week after week in the House pushing their extreme anti-choice and antifreedom agenda.

Let's not forget, as Republicans ignore calls for reproductive freedom, they are ignoring the tragic realities that moms and expectant moms face every day. American families are being torn apart by our country's maternal mortality crisis and with the highest maternal mortality rate of any high-income country.

Instead of addressing the urgency of this crisis and providing moms with the healthcare and resources they need to thrive, my colleagues are advancing legislation that would do the exact opposite. Despite its misleading name, this bill makes access to reproductive care even more difficult for women who need it.

It is a new year, but the extreme MAGA agenda has stayed the same: erode our freedoms and restrict abortion rights despite the suffering that is happening all over our country in a post-Dobbs world.

Instead of passing legislation that will fund the government throughout 2024, they are using these precious hours before a government shutdown to advance anti-choice legislation.

I am proud that Democrats are committed to safeguarding these same freedoms, and we will not be silent on this issue.

This bill is not an effort to protect pregnant students. It does not address the barriers these students face in our education system.

□ 1415

If it did, it would include provisions that also inform students about Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC. Instead, this legislation is an obvious attempt to limit students' access to reproductive healthcare decisions and influence pregnancy outcomes.

When we act on legislation like H.R. 6914, we are sending a clear message to women in our country that we do not prioritize their health and well-being, and we do not value their ability to make their own choices.

We must do better.

On this anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we must pass legislation that provides women with the freedom to make decisions aligned with their health and reinstates our Federal right to abortion. Furthermore, we must support women and mothers along the way.

As you may be aware, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, also known as WIC, is set to face a \$1 billion shortfall, leaving millions of American families vulnerable.

There are nearly 7 million low-income pregnant and postpartum participants, infants, and young children who rely on this program. For more than 25 years, there has been a bipartisan commitment to provide adequate funding for WIC. It is these priorities that should be front and center today, not

creating more barriers and further restricting reproductive rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, for this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. The amendment would provide students with information on access to Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add the text of this amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about supporting pregnant students. There are many resources for pregnant students, both on and off campus. This bill would connect students to these important resources. Many are nonprofit organizations, not just government programs.

In particular, I have heard of inspiring and innovative partnerships between colleges and nonprofit organizations to support student mothers.

For example, Belmont Abbey College in Belmont, North Carolina, has an incredible partnership with a noncampus maternity home, MiraVia. At MiraVia's college residence, expectant mothers are welcomed and provided with a place to live free of charge.

Pregnant students receive a private suite, meals, childcare, diapers, baby clothing and supplies, nursery furniture, life skill classes, personalized guidance to identify additional community resources, and coordination of education and career opportunities.

Belmont Abbey College gives pregnant mothers at MiraVia a full scholarship. This is just one example. I am sure many of my colleagues have more examples of support provided by colleges and universities for students and their babies.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for yielding time and for all her incredible work.

Madam Speaker, I have to hand it to the majority. With this bill, the MAGA

majority has reached new heights or lows, as you want to define it, that are new and creative. They have named this bill, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and didn't bother to include any rights or resources. Not a single new resource or protection for pregnant students.

This bill does nothing to support student parents. It is another vehicle for promoting anti-abortion propaganda and deceiving Americans about their healthcare options. All of this from the same majority that eliminated funding for childcare on college campuses—funding that helps students have their children in childcare so they can go to class. It was defunded by the majority. It was zeroed out.

They pull that one day, and then the next day they want students to believe they care about them? Give me a break.

One in five undergrads are parents.

Has anyone on the other side of the aisle talked to those parents about what they need? If they did, they would find out those students need the same thing as any parent: reproductive freedom, access to childcare, access to maternity care, access to contraception, and access to abortion care.

Madam Speaker, let's fund childcare, not propaganda. Let's restore the reproductive freedom of every single American. That is how you help students, by empowering them, not playing a cynical game with their lives.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6914, the so-called Pregnant Students' Rights Act.

In a post-Roe world where women face State-sanctioned abortion bans and complicated legal challenges to access healthcare, students should be aware of all of their reproductive options and protections.

Yet, House Republicans in this bill are denying students the choice to decide by pushing an extreme bill that would keep students in the dark about the comprehensive healthcare choices, resources, and all of the rights that are available to them.

On its face, the bill purports to provide pregnant students with resources available to them while they are seeking an education. In fact, the bill requires colleges and universities to distribute only partial information about existing rights under Title IX, as well as selective information on resources that solely encourage students to carry a pregnancy to term.

Now, how can you make an informed and potentially life-changing decision if you are only provided with partial information about your rights and available resources?

Madam Speaker, students already face challenges on campus, including

mental health problems, financial and food insecurity, academic difficulties, just to name a few. This bill would make life much more challenging for students, but the true danger is in what the Republicans carefully left out.

For example, the bill fails to require schools to inform students about contraception, which would help students actually avoid unplanned pregnancies; their rights and resources if they experience a miscarriage; and vital resources if they need to terminate a pregnancy due to health-related emergencies.

In short, the bill provides students with just some of their rights, only selective rights. Contrary to their claims, the bill does not provide any new rights or resources like childcare assistance or affordable housing for pregnant or parenting students.

Additionally, if a student decides to carry a child to term, this bill will not even provide any information on how to obtain funding, childcare, nutrition support like WIC, affordable housing options, or other critical supports.

The bottom line is that here we are again wasting time with another harmful bill that jeopardizes sexual and reproductive healthcare for women. Restricting access to important information is both extreme and defies common sense.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the Coalition for Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy, signed by 60 organizations, opposing H.R. 6914 because this legislation "would not address the key barriers to pregnant students' educational attainment, and instead would further shame and stigmatize people for their pregnancy outcomes."

JANUARY 18, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: The Coalition for Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy is a diverse group of advocates and experts dedicated to advancing civil rights protections and institutional resources for pregnant and parenting students. We are joined by the undersigned organizations in voicing our opposition to H.R. 6914, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act—a thinly veiled anti-abortion law which would not address the key barriers to pregnant students—educational attainment, and instead would further shame and stigmatize people for their pregnancy outcomes.

This latest bill to "protect the rights of pregnant students" falls far short of the protections that are actually necessary for pregnant and parenting students and their children.

Students who are pregnant and/or parents deserve to complete their education free

from bias and harassment, in environments that support them on their educational journeys. Unfortunately, pregnant and parenting students are routinely stigmatized, discriminated against, and denied the resources, accommodations, and support they need to thrive in their educational institutions.

More than 5.4 million college students in the United States are parents, which is nearly one quarter of undergraduate students and nearly one third of graduate students. Despite earning higher GPAs than non-parenting students, parenting college students are less likely to graduate. This is not due to personal failing, but rather a lack of institutional support and recognition of the unique barriers to college completion for parenting students. Pregnant and parenting students often experience feeling disconnected from the larger education community and are not aware of who they can speak to when they experience discrimination because of their pregnancy or parenting status.

The proposed bill relies on anti-abortion language and seeks to limit students' reproductive healthcare decisions. This type of language is part of a deliberate strategy by the anti-abortion movement to further legal grounds for a national abortion ban now that the Supreme Court has overturned the constitutional right to abortion care as established in *Roe v. Wade*. Furthermore, the bill language contrasts with existing legal protections for pregnant students experiencing a range of outcomes related to their pregnancies.

Our belief in personal autonomy and respect for every person's capacity to make their own decisions—including whether to continue their pregnancy or not—is at the core of our work to support pregnant and parenting students. This bill does not contain any meaningful supports that would actually help pregnant and parenting students be able to remain enrolled and meet their educational goals.

Such supports are critically needed, and include:

Strengthened Title IX protections; Non-discrimination protection at the state and local level; Accessible and affordable child care, and increased funding for on-campus child care; Access to early education and pre-kindergarten services; Transportation access; Basic needs security (including food, housing, clothing, etc.); Flexible school attendance policies; Lactation accommodations; Less stigma and shame around young parenthood; Increased accountability measure for institutions who fail to protect pregnant and parenting students; Federal funding to support campus Title IX offices' work to prevent and investigate discrimination against pregnant students; Mandatory data collection on students' parenting statuses. Student Parent Outcomes Act of 2023, which would allow essential data collection on the barriers to college graduation for pregnant and parenting students. But sweeping legislation is necessary to ensure that pregnant and parenting students and their families are protected.

Although pregnant and parenting students face many roadblocks, they can thrive when their educational institutions listen to them, support them, and prevent discrimination against them. While balancing their health, caregiving responsibilities, and educational goals is challenging, these added responsibilities often renew students' dedication to their studies. While the decision to parent and/or continue pregnancy is a personal one, the barriers that pregnant and parenting students face are not. This proposed bill would reinforce structural and institutional bias and scrutiny of the decisions students make regarding their personal lives.

We welcome the opportunity to have an open dialogue with the sponsors of the

"Pregnant Students' Rights Act" and with any other members of Congress who are ready to step up as the champion that pregnant and parenting students in our nation need and deserve.

Sincerely,

The Coalition for Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy:

A Better Balance; Generation Hope; Healthy Teen Network; Institute for Women's Policy Research; Justice and Joy National Collaborative; National Women's Law Center; New America Higher Education Program; Pregnant Scholar Initiative at the Center for WorkLife Law; UNITE-LA.

Joined by:

Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women; American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; BreastfeedLA; California Women's Law Center; Center for Freethought Equality; Center for Reproductive Rights; Clearinghouse on Women's Issues; Colorado Teen Parent Collaborative; End Rape On Campus; Equal Rights Advocates; Family Equality; Feminist Majority Foundation; Guttmacher Institute.

Hadassah; Harvard Law School; If/When/How; Lawyering for Reproductive Justice; Indivisible; Ipas; League of Women Voters of the United States; Legal Momentum, The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund; Michigan Organization on Adolescent Sexual Health (MOASH); National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health; National Association of Social Workers; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy and Community Empowerment; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice.

National Network to End Domestic Violence; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Political Caucus; Partners in Abortion Care; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Positive Women's Network-USA; Power to Decide; Public Justice; Reproductive Freedom for All (formerly NARAL Pro-Choice America); SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; Stop Sexual Assault in Schools; The Hope Center at Temple University; Union for Reform Judaism; Women of Reform Judaism; Won't She Do It; YWCA USA.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, the so-called Pregnant Students' Rights Act does nothing to strengthen pregnant students' existing protections and freedoms, and it leaves pregnant students in the dark about their rights under Federal civil rights law.

In fact, when committee Democrats tried to include information that would meaningfully support pregnant and parenting students in our committee's markup, Republicans voted down our amendments.

Democrats submitted amendments that would have included information about programs that promote the health and well-being of mothers and children, such as Medicaid and WIC. Coincidentally, these are the very programs Republican appropriators are right now actively working to roll back and defund.

The bill provides partial information, but no help. That is why dozens of

health and reproductive rights organizations, the National Women's Law Center, the National Partnership for Women & Families, and the American Civil Liberties Union have stated that H.R. 6914, "falls far short of the protections that are actually necessary for pregnant and parenting students and their children."

In fact, I have a bill to get students information about their SNAP eligibility. I wish we were doing that right now.

Madam Speaker, college is hard enough already, and we should do our part to ensure that all pregnant students have the resources they need to succeed. The legislation before us does nothing to achieve that goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have characterized this bill as radical, extreme, overreaching, and controlling students. There are so many negative things and then a couple have said, well, it does nothing.

It is sort of confusing. Again, if they have read the five-page bill, they would know that their characterizations of the bill are not at all what it is.

It doesn't do things they say they would like it to do, but that is not our role, Madam Speaker. Our role is to work with students on campuses.

I do think they are really confused about the nature of this bill, and I would encourage anybody watching this to read the bill. The bill, let's be crystal clear, is not about political advocacy. Nothing in this bill prevents a college counselor from discussing the full panoply of options available to pregnant students. Nothing in this bill prevents a pregnant college student from making her own decision.

Rather than political stunts, thanks to a Republican majority, this body is focused on real bills that will have a real effect on the real lives of Americans, particularly pregnant women in college. That is a good thing that we are doing, Madam Speaker.

The Pregnant Students' Rights Act is yet another one of the bills we have focused on in this Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to its passage. I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

Again, I think if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle care about pregnant women, and particularly pregnant women who are enrolled in college, they would vote for this.

If they don't, then I fear it is an indication that they don't care about women who want to carry their babies to term.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak in opposition to the proposed legislation, H.R. 6914, Pregnant Student's Rights Act.

This bill requires higher education institutions that participate in federal education programs to disseminate information on the rights and resources afforded to prospective, full- and part-time students who are pregnant or may become pregnant to encourage them to carry their pregnancy to term.

These institutions would be required to share this information by email at the start of each academic year, in student handbooks, at each orientation for enrolled students, at student health and counseling centers, and on the school's website.

A list of anti-abortion "findings" in the bill insinuate that women who have an abortion are at risk of developing mental health issues, abusing drugs and alcohol, and becoming suicidal.

Amendments in committee offered to make it clear that schools are still allowed to disseminate information on access to sexual and reproductive health services and the rights, protections, and accommodation afforded to students under Title IX, were voted down by Republicans on the Committee.

Additionally, it must be noted that this harmful bill is a futile attempt that will be vetoed by this Administration.

As we know, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 6914.

As highlighted in the White House Statement of Administrative Policy (SAP), the Administration clearly stated its opposition to H.R. 6914 in its current form.

Existing federal civil rights laws have long prohibited discrimination against students on the basis of pregnancy and related conditions, and institutions of higher education are already required to provide reasonable modifications to pregnant students—from modified class schedules to medical leave.

The Administration stated that it will continue taking action to ensure that students know their rights under federal law and have access to the comprehensive, evidence-based information and resources they need to make informed decisions about their health care.

I stand with the Administration in stating that we remain committed to supporting the security, health, and well-being of women and families across the country, and I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make this commitment as well.

I have long supported pregnant people, especially those who are facing the challenges of being pregnant while being a student.

Many students enrolled at an institution of higher learning face unplanned pregnancies and face pressures of either getting an abortion or face academic failure.

According to national statistics, 1 in 5 college students have children, one of the many identified barriers that can make it difficult for students to complete a certificate or credential.

Most student parents are women and more than 2 in 5 are single mothers.

While teenage birth rates have declined significantly across the country in recent decades, Texas remains above the national average, consistently ranking in the top 10 states.

Out of all births in Texas, around 6 percent were teen births in 2019 and 2020.

And a startling proportion of teenagers who gave birth in Texas in 2020—more than 1 in 6—already had at least one other child.

Texas does not require high schools to teach sex education, and the vast majority that do focus on sexual abstinence.

The state has a complicated maze of requirements for teenagers seeking birth control

and is currently operating under the strictest abortion laws in the country.

During this Congress, I have co-sponsored many pieces of legislation that are in support of pregnant people's rights.

Bills that endorse full-term pregnancies, such as the Mommies ACT (H.R. 6004) which seeks improve Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program for low-income mothers, as well as the Perinatal Workforce Act (H.R. 3523) which strives to grow and diversify the perinatal workforce, and for other purposes.

Students currently have insufficient tools to proactively manage their own maternal health and decisions.

For these reasons, namely, to encourage, protect, and support pregnant students across the nation, I am committed to speaking up for the rights of students and pregnant people and confronting the issues that affect them.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 6914 because this bill contradicts our nations long standing fight and advancements in protecting all students and reproductive rights for all Americans.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 969, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Underwood of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6914 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. UNDERWOOD is as follows:

Ms. Underwood moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6914 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, after line 16, insert the following:

“(D) Information on access to Federal programs that support the health and well-being of pregnant women and children, including—

“(i) the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.);

“(ii) the supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

“(iii) the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786); and

“(iv) programs under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1541

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BICE) at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 18, 2024, at 3:04 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 2414.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable Herb Kohl, former Senator from the State of Wisconsin S. Res. 523.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 2872.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LISA P. GRANT,
Deputy Clerk.

AUTHORIZING FULLY ELECTRONIC STAMPS

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2872) to amend the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013 to allow the Secretary of the Interior to issue electronic stamps under such Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Further Additional Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short Title.

Sec. 2. Table of Contents.
Sec. 3. References.

**DIVISION A—FURTHER ADDITIONAL
CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024**
DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

Title I—Health and Human Services
Title II—Compacts
Title III—Counter-UAS Authorities
Title IV—Budgetary Effects

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

**DIVISION A—FURTHER ADDITIONAL
CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024**

SEC. 101. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024 (division A of Public Law 118-15) is further amended—

- (1) by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “March 8, 2024”;
- (2) by striking the date specified in section 106(4) and inserting “March 1, 2024”;
- (3) in section 123, by striking “94 days” and inserting “129 days” and by striking “94-day” and inserting “129-day”;
- (4) in section 124, by striking “\$663,070,000” and inserting “\$2,199,260,000”; and
- (5) by adding after section 146 the following new sections:

“SEC. 147. (a) Amounts made available by section 101 for ‘Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities’ may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to mitigate issuing WARN notices for ‘06-D-141 Uranium Processing Facility, Y-12’ in an amount not to exceed \$760,000,000.

“(b) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 3 days after each use of the authority provided in this section, and the Secretary of Energy shall provide a weekly report to the Committees specifying the obligations incurred for the purposes specified in subsection (a) with amounts made available in this Act.

“SEC. 148. Amounts made available by section 101 for ‘Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Operations’ may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to fund mandatory pay increases and other inflationary adjustments, to maintain and improve air traffic services, to hire and train air traffic controllers, and to continue aviation safety oversight, while avoiding service reductions.”.

This division may be cited as the “Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024”.

DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

TITLE I—HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Subtitle A—Public Health Extenders

**SEC. 101. EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH
CENTERS, NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE
CORPS, AND TEACHING HEALTH
CENTERS THAT OPERATE GME PRO-
GRAMS.**

(a) TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—Section 340H(g)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h(g)) is amended by striking “and \$21,834,247 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024” and inserting “\$21,834,247 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024, and \$16,982,192 for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024”.

(b) EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS.—Section 10503(b)(1)(F) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(1)(F)) is amended by striking

“and \$690,410,959 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024” and inserting “\$690,410,959 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024, and \$536,986,301 for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024”.

(c) EXTENSION FOR THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.—Section 10503(b)(2)(I) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(2)(I)) is amended by striking “and \$53,506,849 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024, and \$41,616,438 for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024”.

(d) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the amendments made by this section shall be subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 117-328 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.).

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3014(h)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “and section 201(d) of the Further Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024” and inserting “section 201(d) of the Further Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024, and section 101(d) of the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024”.

**SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL DIABETES PRO-
GRAMS.**

(a) EXTENSION OF SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS FOR TYPE I DIABETES.—Section 330B(b)(2)(E) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-2(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking “and \$25,890,411 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024” and inserting “\$25,890,411 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024, and \$20,136,986 for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024”.

(b) EXTENDING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS FOR INDIANS.—Section 330C(c)(2)(E) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)(E)) is amended by striking “and \$25,890,411 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024” and inserting “\$25,890,411 for the period beginning on November 18, 2023, and ending on January 19, 2024, and \$20,136,986 for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024”.

**SEC. 103. NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY EXTEN-
SIONS.**

(a) Section 319(e)(8) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d(e)(8)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(b) Section 319L(e)(1)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e(e)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(c) Section 319L-1(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7f(b)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(d)(1) Section 2811A(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh-10b(g)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(2) Section 2811B(g)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh-10c(g)(1)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(3) Section 2811C(g)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh-10d(g)(1)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

(e) Section 2812(c)(4)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh-

11(c)(4)(B)) is amended by striking “January 19, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

Subtitle B—Medicaid

**SEC. 121. DELAYING CERTAIN DISPROPOR-
TIONATE SHARE PAYMENT CUTS.**

Section 1923(f)(7)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(f)(7)(A)) is amended by striking “January 20, 2024” each place it appears and inserting “March 9, 2024”.

**SEC. 122. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND RE-
DUCTION.**

Section 1941(b)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$5,796,117,810” and inserting “\$5,140,428,729”.

Subtitle C—Medicare

**SEC. 131. EXTENSION OF THE WORK GEO-
GRAPHIC INDEX FLOOR UNDER THE
MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

Section 1848(e)(1)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(e)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “January 20, 2024” and inserting “March 9, 2024”.

SEC. 132. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$2,250,795,056” and inserting “\$2,197,795,056”.

Subtitle D—Human Services

**SEC. 141. EXTENSION OF CHILD AND FAMILY
SERVICES PROGRAMS.**

Activities authorized by part B of title IV of the Social Security Act shall continue through March 8, 2024, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2023, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

**SEC. 142. SEXUAL RISK AVOIDANCE EDUCATION
EXTENSION.**

Section 510 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 710) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—
(A) by striking “and” after “November 17, 2023.”; and

(B) by inserting “and for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024,” after “January 19, 2024.”; and
(2) in subsection (f)(1)—
(A) by striking “and” before “for the period beginning on November 18, 2023.”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024, an amount equal to the pro rata portion of the amount appropriated for the corresponding period for fiscal year 2023.”.

**SEC. 143. PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDU-
CATION EXTENSION.**

Section 513 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 713) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “and” after “November 17, 2023.”; and

(ii) by inserting “and for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024,” after “January 19, 2024.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i)—
(i) by striking “and” after “November 17, 2023.”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024,” after “January 19, 2024.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “and” before “for the period beginning on November 18, 2023.”; and

(B) by striking “fiscal year 2023.” and inserting “fiscal year 2023, and for the period beginning on January 20, 2024, and ending on March 8, 2024, an amount equal to the pro rata portion of the amount appropriated for the corresponding period for fiscal year 2023.”.

TITLE II—COMPACTS**SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE COMPACTS OF FREE ASSOCIATION WITH THE FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS.**

Section 2101(a)(1) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024 and Other Extensions Act (Public Law 118–15; 137 Stat. 81; 137 Stat. 114) is amended by striking “February 2, 2024” and inserting “March 8, 2024”.

TITLE III—COUNTER-UAS AUTHORITIES**SEC. 301. COUNTER-UAS AUTHORITIES.**

Section 210G(i) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n(i)) is amended by striking “February 3, 2024” and inserting “March 9, 2024”.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS**SEC. 401. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this division shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) **CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this division shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of such Act;

(2) for purposes of an allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(3) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman from Connecticut opposed to the motion?

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that basis, pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) each will control 20 minutes.

The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and that she be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the short-term continuing resolution. While we have made progress in our efforts to finish fiscal year 2024 bills, Congress has much

more work to do, and more time is needed to negotiate bills both sides can support.

The House and Senate took very different approaches in this year's bills, and finding common ground will not be easy. However, now that the Speaker has negotiated a top line, we can move forward.

I want to be clear. As we begin to conference these bills, House Republicans are committed to fighting for meaningful policy changes.

I thank the Speaker for his reasonable plan to keep the government open and give Congress more time to negotiate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this CR, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me step back and wish the chair of the Appropriations Committee, Ms. GRANGER, a happy birthday.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution, which I hope is the last of the fiscal year 2024 appropriations process.

This continuing resolution keeps the government open while the Appropriations Committees in the House and the Senate continue bipartisan negotiations on final 2024 funding bills that are in line with the agreement we have had since last June.

I am encouraged by the conversations that have taken place since the top-line numbers were reaffirmed in the Schumer-Johnson agreement, and I appreciate the good faith and the respectful four-corner negotiation that took place to put forward this continuing resolution.

I hope the current pace and tone will result in swiftly finalizing all 2024 funding bills in a bipartisan fashion.

I might add that I think the Senate just voted a short time ago, overwhelmingly, I think, 77–18, to move forward the appropriations bills.

House Republicans wasted the entire duration of the first continuing resolution and most of the second arguing over 2024 funding levels they agreed to last summer. However, I believe we have finally moved on from that charade, and there is now a mutual understanding that the only way to finally end the saga of 2024 funding is to write appropriations bills that can earn the support of both Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate, bills that will likely need to pass under suspension of the rules like the bill we are considering today.

While there may be a Republican majority on paper, more than 200 Democrats will be needed to keep the government's lights on and ensure that the American people have uninterrupted access to the services and programs that help their families stay healthy, boost our economy, and keep us safe and secure.

That is why Democrats in both Chambers have also made clear that the final funding bill cannot include any poison pill riders.

In addition to negotiating and passing the 12 appropriations bills, Congress still must respond to President Biden's supplemental request for our urgent national security needs. We must quickly provide additional support to Ukraine in their fight against Russian tyranny. We cannot allow Vladimir Putin to be rewarded for perpetuating a pointless and bloody war. We cannot allow Russia to bully sovereign nations into ceding their territory to a tyrant.

We know Putin believes that “Russia's borders do not end anywhere.” He is profoundly mistaken, and we must prove him definitively wrong.

We must also support Israel's efforts to defeat Hamas while ensuring we do everything possible to protect innocent lives and provide humanitarian aid.

Finally, we must work in good faith to resolve the very difficult and critical issues at our southern border. We have to come to a bipartisan compromise and show the American people Congress is still able to address urgent crises.

Congress must avoid a shutdown. We must enact full-year spending bills and emergency assistance for Ukraine, for Israel, and for the civilians caught in the crossfire, as well as for our border and for the American people, as soon as possible. To those ends, let this be our last continuing resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the legislation that was just sent to the United States House of Representatives from the United States Senate.

I just spent a good deal of time going around the country, traveling to Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina. Madam Speaker, you might imagine why.

I spoke to thousands of Americans. Not one American said: Please, Congressman ROY, add more money to the debt. Please, Congressman ROY, keep spending money we don't have. Keep deficit spending every year, bankrupting our kids and grandkids.

Nonetheless, that is precisely what we are doing yet again, kicking the can down the road. That is what we do. It is what we do best in this Chamber. It is what we do best in Congress. It is why the American people are so frustrated with this town and with the swamp because it is a swamp that is entirely not drained.

We are sitting here doing the same thing again. It is Groundhog Day in the House Chamber all the time, every day, yet again spending money we don't have.

Last year, an agreement was reached with spending levels and caps. Now, I didn't particularly love those levels

and caps. A number of us didn't. There were supposedly some side deals.

Madam Speaker, does that sound swampy? Side deals. What was written into the law? What was written into the law was a level that was somewhere around a 1 percent reduction over last year's enormously bloated omnibus spending level, a 1 percent cut.

Can this body possibly adhere to those caps? No. We can't do that.

Last year, we tried to fix this place. We tried to do appropriations bills. We passed 10 appropriations bills out of the committee and 7 appropriations bills off the floor. We tried to restore regular order. We had about 1,100 amendments. We tried to process those so the American people could see their Chamber working again.

Nevertheless, what happened? Everything reverts back to the mean in this town, the same old story because a side deal is cut. We have to spend at a higher level, you see, Madam Speaker, and that is what is going on back and forth between the Senate and the House.

The American people need to understand what is happening. This continuing resolution will fund their government at the same level as last year's massive omnibus spending bill that all of my Republican colleagues, all of them with the exception of two in this Chamber, were adamantly opposed to, voted against, spoke out against, put press releases out against, and campaigned against, and they are going to vote for it.

Right now, they are going to vote to continue to spend at that level. Not only that, they are going to vote to continue to fund the radical progressive policies embedded in it, continue to fund the bureaucracy that is at war with the American people, continue to fund open borders, and continue to fund Alejandro Mayorkas even as we attempt to impeach him in the Homeland Security Committee.

We are going to fund him. We are going to fund those open borders. We are going to fund the United Nations. We are going to fund the World Health Organization. We are going to fund UNRWA to give money to the Palestinians to give to Hamas.

We are going to campaign against those things, but we are going to fund them.

My Democratic colleagues want to hide behind side deals rather than adhere to the agreed-upon caps that would at least modestly reduce spending by 1 percent.

That is what is happening in this Chamber, and we are going to do this CR in order to buy time to cut a deal that will increase spending, that will increase spending past the caps in order to honor side deals and to actually increase the funding for a Federal Government that is at war with the people whom I represent.

That is shameful. Under no circumstances should we vote for that. Under no circumstances is this some-

thing that we should be supporting. We should stay here and do our work, but, instead, people said: Why can't you give the time back, Congressman ROY, so we can go catch our planes before the snowstorm gets in?

I am sorry. I think maybe we should stay here and do our job and actually find a way to cut spending like we campaigned on over and over again.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership, and I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. ROY) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I agree with Mr. ROY's comments. This continuing resolution extends government funding at the same levels of the lameduck Biden-Pelosi omnibus.

To be clear, this funding is going to continue funding Biden's disastrous policies, such as the Biden border crisis, Biden's war on American energy production, and a woke and weaponized bureaucracy.

Our Nation owes almost \$34 trillion in debt and counting, and the interest the Treasury Department must pay is steadily marching higher and higher. Over the next decade, annual Federal Government deficits are projected to double to nearly \$3 trillion, and the cost of our interest on the debt will exceed the Pentagon's budget within the next 10 years.

Our Speaker, Mr. JOHNSON, said he was the most conservative Speaker we have ever had, yet here we are, putting this bill on the floor this afternoon without conservative policy riders. Conservatives don't have the chance to amend it. We are honoring the McCarthy-Schumer side deals from the Fiscal Responsibility Act that led us to vacate Speaker McCarthy in the first place.

Talk is cheap, and the American people deserve better.

The notion of fiscal discipline itself might as well be put in a time capsule. Congress considers no budgets. Legislation never hits against cost limitations. Every bipartisan disagreement is solved simply by spending more on the pet programs of the opposing party.

This continuing resolution is a perfect example of how we have arrived at this unsustainable fiscal situation, and

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

The last thing I want to say is that I think it is rich to hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle discussing the sovereignty of the Ukraine border and how necessary it is to protect their borders while we do nothing to protect our own.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for his comments.

I would note that, in this bill, we will be voting to fund, as I said, a Department of Homeland Security responsible for the border crisis with wide-open borders and continued funding for the CBP One app being used to use parole abusively to flood the zone into Texas where Texas is having to spend \$12.5 billion doing the job of the Federal Government.

We will fund the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, which lost track of 85,000 migrant children, and the Environmental Protection Agency's electric vehicle mandate to make two-thirds of new cars EVs by 2032, destroying our economy and piling up EVs on the lots of car dealerships around the country. We will fund the EPA's natural gas and methane rule, destroying access to reliable energy. We will fund the EPA's power plant rules aimed at knocking off coal and natural gas power plants, making us wholly dependent on wind and sun for energy, the unreliable energy that it is.

We will fund the IRS doling out billions in IRA tax credits to corporations, many of them billion-dollar corporations.

We will fund the World Health Organization undermining our own sovereignty and cozying up to the CCP.

We will fund the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, UNRWA, which supports Hamas over our ally Israel. Even as we go out and give lip service to supporting Israel, we will be voting to fund their enemies right now, today, on the floor of the House.

We will fund the pro-China, anti-Israel United Nations Human Rights Council.

We will fund a weaponized Department of Justice and FBI going after parents like Scott Smith and Mark Houck.

I have more.

That is what we are doing. We are voting to fund a Federal bureaucracy that is at war with the American people while we indebt our children for generations.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ROY for yielding time.

Here we go again. The more things change, the more things stay the same.

Fourteen months ago, we asked the American people to give us the majority. They entrusted us with the majority, running primarily on fiscal responsibility and securing the border. Thirteen months ago, we roundly condemned the omnibus, the \$1.6 trillion Christmas omnibus that was put in place 13 months ago. Yet, we are operating today and now extending the very Biden-Pelosi-Schumer policies that are bankrupting the country, destroying the country, and under which the American people are suffering.

Suffering, you ask. Yes. They are suffering under record 40-year high inflation and 20-year high interest rates. The average American family is paying \$1,000 more a month for essentials than they were paying when the President was first elected 3 years ago.

□ 1600

We have a \$200 billion monthly deficit, \$2.5 trillion a year. As has already been said, we are \$34 trillion in national debt. We will be \$36 trillion in debt by the time we get to this next election, and we have the majority in one-half of the legislative branch.

When will that begin to account for something? When will that begin to matter for something? When you have the majority in one branch or one House of one branch, shouldn't you get half of what your policy priorities are? Shouldn't you get half of your spending objectives?

Yet, what we seem to do over and over is decide what the Senate will take, what the President will sign, and that is what we send to the other body. That is what we send when we have the majority here in this very House.

When is that going to matter? What are we prepared to do? What are the red lines that we are willing to draw, and what are we not willing to do just to keep government open?

We say that we are getting things done. We say that we are working together. We say that we are showing that we can govern, and yet, we are not even willing to risk a temporary pause in the 15 percent of the nonessential part of the government in order to try to force change here in Washington.

No. We are going to continue the status quo. We did this in May with the failed responsibility act. We did it with the continuing resolution in September. We did it with the continuing resolution in November. We did it with the NDAA. We did it with the FISA extension without reforms. Today, we are going to pass another major piece of legislation, predominantly with Democrat votes, minority votes, when we have the House majority.

This is a loser for the American people. It is a loser for the country. How many times have we said on our side the border is the fight to have. The polls overwhelmingly show that is the number one issue of the American people. They blame the Biden administration. They blame the President for his failed border policies that are faci-

tating the border invasion. Just yesterday, 14 Democrats from the minority party voted with us to condemn, denounce, and call for an end to the President's open-border policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, we could have utilized that momentum to attach border security to this continuing resolution. We could have then dared the Senate to vote against it and dared the Senate to vote against funding the government and securing the border, and we failed to do even that.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, there are other things that we are funding that we shouldn't: The ATF rule banning up to 40 million pistol braces; the ATF rule massively expanding background checks without the consent of Congress; the Department of Education's student debt cancellation schemes, despite the Supreme Court ruling against them; public health agencies like the CDC, the NIH, and FSA held unaccountable for COVID tyranny, enforcing masks and vaccines upon our children; the Department of Veterans Affairs vaccine mandate, which I have introduced legislation to get rid of; the chief diversity officers at the Department of Defense and throughout government, indoctrinating people, pushing out a radical, leftist agenda with critical race theory and DEI; the Pentagon's abortion travel fund; the FDA's rule allowing abortion drugs to be shipped by mail; taxpayer-funded gender transition surgeries at the Department of Defense.

We are funding all of that with taxpayer money and borrowed money. We are indebting our kids and our grandkids to fund the bureaucrats that are undermining the freedom of the American people, preventing them from being able to prosper, according to the rights given to them by the Almighty because this government is failing to do its job, and worse, is interfering with their God-given rights to do what they want to do for their families.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I always tell people back home: Beware of bipartisanship. The most bipartisan thing in Washington, D.C., is bankrupting our country, if not financially, morally.

As my colleague from Texas just highlighted, it is not just the spending; it is all the terrible policies that are attached to the spending.

We can tell by the way the time is structured, but it is bipartisan. It is 50/

50 Republicans and Democrats. One of the mottos in the first unit I was in in the Army was, "Deeds Not Words." The words are so good.

I was down at the border with the Speaker and 60 of my colleagues, and we were going to fight. We were only going to fund a border that is secure. We were going to fund the government, but only if we secure the border. We were going to make the Senate a counteroffer, but by the time we could even get back to this town, our Speaker had surrendered to a four-corners deal, the very thing we said we wouldn't do.

It is the deeds that are the problem. If we were back in the minority, we would be united again. We would be opposed to this. We were just a year ago. We were opposed to it. The words were good, and the deeds were also good, but now when we have the chance to govern, it seems we have lost our resolve.

Who is getting hurt by this? The American people are getting hurt by this.

None of us promised to come here and do this. We promised, as Republicans, things that are in conflict with the Biden administration's promises, and the only way we are going to do that is to force the vote.

By going along with this, let's be clear, we are being buried. We are being buried by debt. We are being buried by crime. We are being buried by an invasion at our border, buried by fentanyl, buried by drugs, by suicide, by endless wars, by failing schools, by corruption. Frankly, it is a fatal overdose of government. I wish I could just wake up and it not be true, but it is.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The American people are tired of getting a complete lack of representation from their Representatives. Nobody in this country looks at Congress and says: Wow. Heck of a job, guys and gals. Well done.

Who would do that? Would we do that?

By the way, it does not matter who is sitting in the Speaker's seat or who has got the majority. We keep doing the same stupid stuff.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no problem with wide-open borders endangering the people that I represent. None. My constituents are the ones left holding the bag, and the people of Texas are the ones left spending \$12.5 billion. My people are the ones who have had six kids die from fentanyl poisoning in the school district that I represent.

It is not fun to smirk at that, is it? We are talking about dead children from fentanyl poisoning because of wide-open borders because of the policies of my Democrat colleagues who refuse to do anything about it. My colleagues won't do anything about the

wide-open borders. I will continue to speak to my colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I am addressing my comments to the Chair. I am addressing the Chair on behalf of the people that I represent who are dying in Texas because of Democrats, directly because of Democrat policies. They can shake their heads all they want, but the blood of the people in Texas is on their hands.

My colleagues flippantly dismiss the fact that people in Texas are dying because of their policies, and the migrants that they pretend to care about are dying because of their policies. Then they lie and say that Texas is responsible for migrants who die in the Rio Grande River when their own Department of Justice offers the truth, which is, those migrants died in the river and were pulled out by Mexican authorities before Border Patrol was ever contacted.

The Democrats have no problem lying to the American people just like Alejandro Mayorkas lied to the American people about Border Patrol agents whipping Haitian migrants.

It is something that happens over and over and over again, but the question for my colleagues on this side of the aisle is: What are we going to do about it? Are we going to keep writing them a blank check? Are we going to keep saying: Here is more money, Secretary Mayorkas? Leave us exposed. Leave people dying. Leave children dying from fentanyl. Migrants are dying in the Rio Grande, so we can go out and campaign on border security.

Why don't we do something about it?

Here we are, again. Catch your flights. Get on out of Washington, D.C., before the snowstorm comes in, but give them all the money in the world they need to endanger the people that we represent.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, everybody in this country expects us to do our job, and yet, we continually fail to do it.

We continue to spend money we don't have, undermining our own national security, and our own well-being, funding a bureaucracy that is at war with the people that we represent.

At some point, we ought to actually do what we campaign on. At some point, on both sides of the aisle, we should actually recognize that the American people expected a republic for the Representatives that they send to the United States House of Representatives to actually represent them.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, as I said at the outset, this continuing resolution keeps the government open while the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate continue bipartisan negotiations on the final 2024 funding bills that are in line with the agreement that we have had since last June.

I am so encouraged by the conversations that have taken place since the top-line numbers were reaffirmed. I appreciate the good faith and respectful four-corner negotiation that took place to put forward this continuing resolution.

My hope is that the current pace and tone will result in swiftly finalizing all of the 2024 funding bills in a bipartisan fashion because that is what we are here to do. That is our job to govern. That is what the American people expect of us.

Some of my colleagues would see that this government would shut down and don't care how hurtful that would be. I have a quick story to share.

Today, on my way to a meeting in the CVC, a young woman who I see just about every day, called me over and with fear in her face, she said to me: Are you going to keep the government open? I said: We are. She said: Thank you. You don't know how stressed we all are and fearful of what will happen to our jobs and our families.

Some of my colleagues would like to see a government shutdown because we don't pay a price. We don't give up our salaries. Maybe if we did, people would have a different view, but that young woman knows that if this government shuts down, she will not be able to take care of her family. That is what people should be thinking about in this body this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I say to my colleagues, let's do what is right for the American people and the people who work in this institution and who work in agencies all over this country. They need to know that we can govern, that we want to govern, and that we know how to govern.

I believe that is possible in a bipartisan way. I have seen it in the past. I look forward to proceeding now.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, when Congress fails to do its job, the consequences are real.

Families suffer, the economy takes a hit, and government costs rise—all unnecessarily.

The Senate Amendment to H.R. 2872—Further Additional Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 proves one thing, this dysfunctional Republican majority is unable to govern without help from the Democratic Caucus.

Instead of working to finish the FY 2024 funding process between now and when the

first CR was enacted, House Republicans wasted time by ousting their own leader, further propelling the House into chaos and bringing partisan bills to the floor that not only have zero chance of becoming law but include massive cuts and poison pill riders that move us further apart, not closer to resolution.

H.R. 2872 would avoid a government shutdown today, but kicks the can down the road and adds unnecessary complexities that will increase the likelihood of future shutdowns by creating two separate CR dates.

This Continuing Resolution (CR) provides for continued funding at FY23 levels with two end dates:

March 1, 2024: Agriculture, Energy and Water, MilConVA, and THUD Appropriations

March 8, 2024: CJS, Defense, FSGG, Homeland Security, Interior, Labor HHS, Education, Legislative Branch, and SFOps

The bill also includes a number of anomalies for public health extenders, Medicaid, Medicare, Human Services, Compacts, and Counter-UAS Authorities.

This legislation also lacks emergency supplemental funding for Ukraine, Israel, humanitarian assistance, childcare, disaster victims, broadband, Indo-Pacific allies, and a number of other pressing priorities.

Although this legislation is flawed in many significant ways, a government shutdown would be devastating for Americans across the country.

A government shutdown would hurt hard working families in Texas:

172,877 active duty and reserve personnel serving our nation's armed forces in Texas would be forced to go without the pay they earn during a shutdown.

The Small Business Administration would stop processing small business loans, halting a program that provides \$2,742,702,800 in funding to small businesses in Texas every year.

176,276 people flying through Texas airports every day would face potential delays and safety concerns due to staffing impacts on TSA agents and air traffic controllers.

786,686 people in Texas would soon lose access to Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) benefits.

168,413 federal workers in Texas would be furloughed or forced to work without pay, in addition to the many employees of businesses with government contracts who could be laid off, furloughed, or see their hours cut.

Workers at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) would be sidelined, risking interruptions and delays to the 892 food safety, pharmaceutical manufacturing, and other inspections conducted in Texas last year.

The Department of Agriculture would be forced to stop processing housing loans, which provide \$456,125,359 in funding to help 2,742 families in rural Texas communities buy homes every year.

The Department of Agriculture would be forced to stop processing farm loans which provide \$209,391,000 in funding for farmers in Texas every year.

3,291,584 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) beneficiaries in Texas would lose access to benefits in a prolonged shutdown.

5,413,161 people who visit national parks in Texas every year would be turned away or unable to fully access parks, monuments, and museums.

State governments would be forced to pay for federal services like the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, potentially risking benefits for the 20,846 TANF beneficiaries in Texas.

A government shutdown would hurt working families, damage our economy, interrupt vital services, endanger our national security, and force millions of our troops and government employees to work without pay.

It is time to get serious, it is time to do the work we are required to do as Members of Congress regardless of our political stripes.

Congress has a responsibility to keep our government open, and I hope we can work with House Republicans and the Senate to facilitate the timely completion of full-year spending bills and a supplemental package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2872.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 3250;

The motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2872;

The motion to recommit H.R. 6918;

Passage of H.R. 6918, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 6914; and

Passage of H.R. 6914, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REMOTE ACCESS TO COURT PROCEEDINGS FOR VICTIMS OF THE 1988 BOMBING OF PAN AM FLIGHT 103 OVER LOCKERBIE, SCOTLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3250) to provide remote access to court proceedings for victims of the 1988 Bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

VAN DREW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 7, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—413

Adams	Davids (KS)	Huffman
Aderholt	Davidson	Huizenga
Aguilar	Davis (IL)	Hunt
Alford	Davis (NC)	Issa
Allen	De La Cruz	Ivey
Allred	Dean (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Amo	DeGette	Jackson (NC)
Amodei	DeLauro	Jackson (TX)
Armstrong	DeBene	Jackson Lee
Arrington	Deluzio	Jacobs
Auchincloss	DeSaulnier	James
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Jayapal
Baird	Dingell	Jeffries
Balderson	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Balint	Donalds	Johnson (LA)
Banks	Duarte	Johnson (SD)
Barr	Duncan	Jordan
Barragán	Dunn (FL)	Joyce (OH)
Bean (FL)	Edwards	Joyce (PA)
Beatty	Ellzey	Kamlager-Dove
Bentz	Emmer	Kaptur
Bera	Escobar	Kean (NJ)
Bergman	Eshoo	Keating
Beyer	Españillat	Kelly (IL)
Bice	Estes	Kelly (MS)
Biggs	Evans	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Ezell	Khanna
Bishop (GA)	Fallon	Kiggans (VA)
Bishop (NC)	Feenstra	Kildee
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Kiley
Boebert	Finstad	Kilmer
Bonamici	Fischbach	Kim (CA)
Bost	Fitzgerald	Kim (NJ)
Bowman	Fitzpatrick	Krishnamoorthi
Boyle (PA)	Fleischmann	Kuster
Brecheen	Fletcher	Kustoff
Brown	Flood	LaHood
Brownley	Foster	LaLota
Buchanan	Foushee	LaMalfa
Buck	Fox	Lamborn
Bucshon	Frankel, Lois	Landsman
Budzinski	Franklin, Scott	Langworthy
Burchett	Frost	Larsen (WA)
Burgess	Fry	Larson (CT)
Burlison	Fulcher	Latta
Bush	Gaetz	LaTurner
Calvert	Gallagher	Lawler
Cammack	Gallego	Lee (CA)
Caraveo	Garamendi	Lee (FL)
Carbajal	Garbarino	Lee (NV)
Cárdenas	Garcia (IL)	Lee (PA)
Carey	Garcia (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Carl	Garcia, Mike	Lesko
Carson	Garcia, Robert	Letlow
Carter (GA)	Gimenez	Levin
Carter (LA)	Golden (ME)	Lieu
Carter (TX)	Goldman (NY)	Lofgren
Cartwright	Gomez	Loudermilk
Casar	Gonzales, Tony	Lucas
Case	Gonzalez,	Luetkemeyer
Casten	Vicente	Luttrell
Castor (FL)	Good (VA)	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Gooden (TX)	Mace
Chavez-DeRemer	Gottheimer	Magaziner
Cherfilus-	Granger	Malliotakis
McCormick	Graves (LA)	Maloy
Chu	Graves (MO)	Mann
Ciscomani	Green (TN)	Manning
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Massie
Clarke (NY)	Greene (GA)	Mast
Cline	Griffith	Matsui
Cloud	Grijalva	McBath
Clyburn	Grothman	McCaull
Cohen	Guest	McClain
Cole	Guthrie	McClellan
Collins	Hageman	McClintock
Comer	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Connolly	Harris	McCormick
Correa	Hayes	McGarvey
Costa	Hern	McGovern
Courtney	Higgins (NY)	McHenry
Craig	Hill	Meeks
Crane	Himes	Menendez
Crawford	Hinson	Meng
Crenshaw	Horsford	Meuser
Crockett	Houchin	Mfume
Crow	Houlahan	Miller (IL)
Cuellar	Hoyer	Miller (OH)
Curtis	Hoyle (OR)	Miller (WV)
D'Esposito	Hudson	Miller-Meeks

Mills	Rogers (AL)	Takano
Molinaro	Rose	Tenney
Moolenaar	Rosendale	Thanedar
Mooney	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Moore (AL)	Rouzer	Thompson (MS)
Moore (UT)	Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Tiffany
Moran	Rutherford	Timmons
Morelle	Ryan	Titus
Moskowitz	Salazar	Tlaib
Moulton	Salinas	Tokuda
Mrvan	Sánchez	Tonko
Mullin	Sarbanes	Torres (CA)
Murphy	Scanlon	Torres (NY)
Nadler	Schakowsky	Trahan
Napolitano	Schiff	Trone
Neal	Schneider	Turner
Neguse	Scholten	Underwood
Nehls	Schrier	Valadao
Newhouse	Schweikert	Van Drew
Nickel	Scott (VA)	Van Dwyne
Norcross	Scott, Austin	Van Orden
Nunn (IA)	Scott, David	Vargas
Obermole	Sessions	Vasquez
Ocasio-Cortez	Sewell	Veasey
Omar	Sherrill	Velázquez
Owens	Simpson	Wagner
Pallone	Slotkin	Walberg
Palmer	Smith (MO)	Waltz
Panetta	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Pappas	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Pascrell	Smith (WA)	Waters
Payne	Smucker	Watson Coleman
Peltola	Sorensen	Weber (TX)
Pence	Soto	Webster (FL)
Perez	Spanberger	Wenstrup
Peters	Spartz	Westerman
Pettersen	Stansbury	Wexton
Pfleger	Stanton	Wild
Pingree	Staubert	Williams (GA)
Pocan	Steel	Williams (NY)
Porter	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Posey	Steil	Wilson (FL)
Pressley	Steube	Wilson (SC)
Quigley	Stevens	Wittman
Ramirez	Strickland	Womack
Raskin	Strong	Yakym
Reschenthaler	Swalwell	Zinke
Rodgers (WA)	Sykes	

NAYS—7

Clyde	Luna	Self
Harshbarger	Perry	
Higgins (LA)	Roy	

NOT VOTING—13

Bacon	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Blunt Rochester	Norman	Scalise
Cleaver	Ogles	Sherman
DesJarlais	Pelosi	
Gosar	Phillips	

□ 1641

Mrs. LUNA and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DAVIDSON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Messrs. DUNCAN, WEBER of Texas, and Ms. WEXTON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 14.

AUTHORIZING FULLY ELECTRONIC STAMPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATURNER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2872) to amend

the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013 to allow the Secretary of the Interior to issue electronic stamps under such Act, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 108, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—314

Adams	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Aderholt	Dingell	Khanna
Aguilar	Doggett	Kiggans (VA)
Allen	Duarte	Kildee
Allred	Edwards	Kiley
Amo	Ellzey	Kilmer
Amodi	Emmer	Kim (CA)
Armstrong	Escobar	Kim (NJ)
Balderson	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Balint	Espallat	Kuster
Barr	Evans	Kustoff
Barragán	Feenstra	LaLota
Beatty	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Bentz	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Bera	Fleischmann	Landsman
Beyer	Fletcher	Langworthy
Bice	Flood	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Foushee	Latta
Bonamici	Fox	LaTurner
Bowman	Frankel, Lois	Lawler
Boyle (PA)	Frost	Lee (CA)
Brown	Gallego	Lee (FL)
Brownley	Garamendi	Lee (NV)
Buchanan	Garbarino	Lee (PA)
Bucshon	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Budzinski	Garcia (TX)	Letlow
Bush	Garcia, Mike	Levin
Calvert	Garcia, Robert	Lieu
Caraveo	Jimenez	Lofgren
Carbajal	Golden (ME)	Lucas
Carey	Goldman (NY)	Luetkemeyer
Carson	Gomez	Lynch
Carter (GA)	Gonzalez,	Magaziner
Carter (LA)	Vicente	Malliotakis
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Manning
Cartwright	Granger	Matsui
Casar	Graves (LA)	McBath
Case	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Casten	Green, Al (TX)	McClain
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McClellan
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McCollum
Chavez-DeRemer	Harder (CA)	McGarvey
Cherfilus-	Hayes	McGovern
McCormick	Higgins (NY)	McHenry
Chu	Hill	Meeks
Ciscomani	Himes	Menendez
Clark (MA)	Hinson	Meng
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Meuser
Clyburn	Houlahan	Mfume
Cohen	Hoyer	Miller (WV)
Cole	Hoyle (OR)	Molinaro
Comer	Hudson	Moolenaar
Connolly	Huffman	Moore (UT)
Correa	Huizenga	Moore (WI)
Costa	Issa	Morelle
Courtney	Ivey	Moskowitz
Craig	Jackson (IL)	Moulton
Crawford	Jackson (NC)	Mrvan
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Mullin
Crockett	Jacobs	Murphy
Crow	James	Nadler
Cuellar	Jayapal	Napolitano
D'Esposito	Jeffries	Neal
Davids (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Neguse
Davis (IL)	Johnson (LA)	Newhouse
Davis (NC)	Johnson (OH)	Nickel
De La Cruz	Johnson (SD)	Norcross
Dean (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Nunn (IA)
DeGette	Kamlager-Dove	Ocasio-Cortez
DeLauro	Kaptur	Omar
DelBene	Kean (NJ)	Owens
Deluzio	Keating	Pallone
DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Panetta

Pappas	Scholten	Titus
Pascarell	Schrier	Tlaib
Payne	Scott (VA)	Tokuda
Pelosi	Scott, Austin	Tonko
Peltola	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Pence	Sewell	Torres (NY)
Perez	Sherman	Trahan
Peters	Sherrill	Trone
Pettersen	Simpson	Turner
Pingree	Slotkin	Underwood
Pocan	Smith (MO)	Valadao
Porter	Smith (NE)	Vargas
Pressley	Smith (NJ)	Vasquez
Ramirez	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Raskin	Smucker	Velázquez
Reschenthaler	Sorensen	Wagner
Rodgers (WA)	Soto	Walberg
Rogers (AL)	Spanberger	Wasserman
Ross	Stansbury	Schultz
Rouzer	Stanton	Waters
Ruiz	Steel	Watson Coleman
Ruppersberger	Stevens	Wenstrup
Rutherford	Strickland	Wexton
Ryan	Strong	Wild
Salazar	Swalwell	Williams (GA)
Salinas	Sykes	Williams (NY)
Sánchez	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Tenney	Wilson (SC)
Scanlon	Thanedar	Wittman
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Womack
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Zinke
Schneider	Thompson (PA)	

NAYS—108

Alford	Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)
Arrington	Fry	Miller (OH)
Auchincloss	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Babin	Gallagher	Mills
Baird	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Banks	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Bean (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Bergman	Gosar	Nehls
Biggs	Green (TN)	Norman
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Obornolte
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Palmer
Boebert	Grothman	Perry
Bost	Guest	Pfluger
Brecheen	Hageman	Posey
Buck	Harris	Quigley
Burchett	Harshbarger	Rose
Burgess	Hern	Rosendale
Burlison	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Cammack	Houchin	Schweikert
Carl	Hunt	Self
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Sessions
Cloud	Jordan	Spartz
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Staubert
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Crane	LaHood	Steil
Curtis	Lesko	Steube
Davidson	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Donalds	Luna	Timmons
Duncan	Luttrell	Van Drew
Dunn (FL)	Mace	Van Deyne
Estes	Maloy	Van Orden
Ezell	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fallon	Massie	Webster (FL)
Finstad	Mast	Westerman
Fischbach	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Yakym

NOT VOTING—11

Bacon	DesJarlais	Rogers (KY)
Blunt Rochester	Fulcher	Scalise
Cárdenas	Ogles	Waltz
Cleaver	Phillips	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1649

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would

have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 15, H.R. 2872.

SUPPORTING PREGNANT AND PAR- ENTING WOMEN AND FAMILIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6918) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers, offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 214, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—208

Adams	Foushee	Meeks
Aguilar	Frankel, Lois	Menendez
Allred	Frost	Meng
Amo	Gallego	Mfume
Auchincloss	Garamendi	Moore (WI)
Balint	Garcia (IL)	Morelle
Barragán	Garcia (TX)	Moulton
Beatty	Garcia, Robert	Mrvan
Bera	Golden (ME)	Mullin
Beyer	Goldman (NY)	Nadler
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Gonzalez,	Neal
Bonamici	Vicente	Neguse
Bowman	Gottheimer	Nickel
Boyle (PA)	Green, Al (TX)	Norcross
Brown	Grijalva	Ocasio-Cortez
Brownley	Harder (CA)	Omar
Budzinski	Hayes	Pallone
Bush	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Caraveo	Himes	Pappas
Carbajal	Horsford	Pascarell
Cárdenas	Houlahan	Payne
Carson	Hoyer	Pelosi
Carter (LA)	Hoyle (OR)	Peltola
Cartwright	Huffman	Perez
Casar	Ivey	Peters
Case	Jackson (IL)	Pettersen
Casten	Jackson (NC)	Pingree
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Castro (TX)	Jacobs	Porter
Cherfilus-	Jayapal	Pressley
McCormick	Jeffries	Quigley
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Ramirez
Clark (MA)	Kamlager-Dove	Raskin
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Ross
Clyburn	Keating	Ruiz
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Khanna	Ryan
Correa	Kildee	Salinas
Costa	Kilmer	Sánchez
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Sarbanes
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Scanlon
Crockett	Kuster	Schakowsky
Crow	Landsman	Schiff
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Scholten
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Scott, David
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Sewell
DeLauro	Levin	Sherman
DelBene	Lieu	Sherrill
Deluzio	Lofgren	Slotkin
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Magaziner	Sorensen
Doggett	Manning	Soto
Escobar	Matsui	Spanberger
Eshoo	McBath	Stansbury
Espallat	McClellan	Stanton
Evans	McCollum	Stevens
Fletcher	McGarvey	Strickland
Foster	McGovern	Swalwell

Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko

Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—214

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecht
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz

NOT VOTING—11

Bacon
Blunt Rochester
Cleaver
DesJarlais

James
Moskowitz
Ogles
Phillips

Rogers (KY)
Scalise
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1656

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—214

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecht
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
De La Cruz
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz

Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagaman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)

NAYS—208

Adams
Aguilar
Allred

Amo
Auchincloss
Balint

Barragán
Beatty
Bera

Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)

Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell

NOT VOTING—11

Bacon
Blunt Rochester
Cleaver
DesJarlais

James
Moskowitz
Ogles
Phillips

Rogers (KY)
Scalise
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1703

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Bonamic	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bowman	Hayes	Pelosi
Boyle (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Peltola
Brown	Himes	Perez
Brownley	Horsford	Peters
Budzinski	Houlahan	Pettersen
Bush	Hoyer	Pingree
Caraveo	Hoyle (OR)	Pocan
Carbajal	Huffman	Porter
Cárdenas	Ivey	Pressley
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Carter (LA)	Jackson (NC)	Ramirez
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Casar	Jacobs	Ross
Case	Jayapal	Ruiz
Casten	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Cherfilus-	Kaptur	Sánchez
McCormick	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schneider
Cohen	Kim (NJ)	Scholten
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Correa	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Costa	Landsman	Scott, David
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Craig	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Crockett	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Crow	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Lee (PA)	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Leger Fernandez	Sorensen
Davis (IL)	Levin	Soto
Davis (NC)	Lofgren	Spanberger
Dean (PA)	Lynch	Stansbury
DeGette	Magaziner	Stanton
DeLauro	Manning	Stevens
DelBene	Matsui	Strickland
Deluzio	McBath	Swalwell
DeSaulnier	McClellan	Sykes
Dingell	McCollum	Takano
Doggett	McGarvey	Thanedar
Escobar	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Meeke	Thompson (MS)
Espallat	Menendez	Titus
Evans	Meng	Tlaib
Fletcher	Mfume	Tokuda
Foster	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Foushee	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Torres (NY)
Frost	Mrvan	Trahan
Galleo	Mullin	Trone
Garamendi	Nadler	Underwood
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Vargas
Garcia (TX)	Neal	Vasquez
Garcia, Robert	Neguse	Veasey
Golden (ME)	Nickel	Wasserman
Goldman (NY)	Norcross	Schultz
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Waters
Gonzalez,	Omar	Watson Coleman
Vicente	Pallone	Wexton
Gottheimer	Panetta	Wild
Green, Al (TX)	Pappas	Williams (GA)
Grijalva	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bacon	DesJarlais	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	James	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Lieu	Scalise
Cleaver	Moskowitz	Velázquez
De La Cruz	Ogles	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1718

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 14, "nay" on rollcall No. 15, "nay" on rollcall No. 16, "yea" on rollcall No. 17, "nay" on rollcall No. 18, and "yea" on rollcall No. 19.

MOVING AMERICANS PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to protect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of social security account numbers to young children in cases where confidentiality has been compromised, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECT REPORTERS FROM EXPLOITATIVE STATE SPYING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4250) to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECRUITING FAMILIES USING DATA ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3058) to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve foster and adoptive parent recruitment and retention, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ENSURE THE SECURITY OF OFFICE SPACE RENTED BY SENATORS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3222) to ensure the security of office space rented by Senators, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SECURITY OF OFFICE SPACE RENTED BY SENATORS.

Section 3 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1975 (2 U.S.C. 6317) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (12) as subparagraphs (A) through (L), respectively;

(B) by striking "The aggregate" and inserting "(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the aggregate"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) The aggregate square feet of office space for purposes of paragraph (1) shall not include any portion of the office space used for security or safety enhancements that are—

"(A) of a kind authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, which shall include an information technology security closet and a secure lobby or reception area; and

"(B) approved by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate."; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking "The maximum" and inserting "(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the maximum"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) The portion of the cost of a rental described in subparagraph (A) that is attributable to building security and safety measures shall not be included in determining the annual rate paid for the rental for purposes of subparagraph (A) if—

"(i) the costs are for building security and safety measures—

"(I) of a kind authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, which shall include guard services, access control, and facility monitoring; and

“(II) approved by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; and

“(ii) such costs are itemized separately in a manner approved by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 18, 2024, at 3:26 p.m.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 25.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LISA P. GRANT
Deputy Clerk.

□ 1730

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2872

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of H.R. 2872, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall amend the title so as to read: “Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 18, 2024.

I hereby designate the period from Thursday, January 18, 2024, through Sunday, January 28, 2024, as a “district work period” under section 3(z) of House Resolution 5.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HONORING BILL JOHNSON

(Mr. BALDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friend and fellow Ohioan, BILL JOHNSON, as he steps away from Congress to serve the students, staff, and faculty of Youngstown State University.

I have had the honor to work alongside BILL for a number of years, and one thing I have learned is that he is passionate about public service.

I met BILL in 2010 during his first campaign for Congress where he was faced with the tall task of unseating an incumbent. As we all know, BILL never shies away from a challenge, and he came out from the other side victorious thanks to his relentless work ethic and dedication to serving the communities of eastern Ohio.

He provided guidance and support to me when I decided to run for Congress, and he was an important resource for me when I worked to earn a spot alongside him on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the greatest committee on Capitol Hill.

We will certainly miss having BILL here in Washington, and I wish him; his wife, LeeAnn; and his son, Nathan, the best in this exciting new chapter of their lives.

REPUBLICAN WAR ON WOMEN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Republican war on women and their continued efforts to lie about it in Congress. Their bill, H.R. 6918, is named the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, but it does not do that at all.

It takes food money away from lower income families, and it gives it to the most extreme antiwomen and antifamily groups in America.

Also, it would force women to give birth before they are ready to have families, and numerous studies show such births create more poor children who will need government assistance or go hungry.

A bill that helped families would include provisions for childcare and paid family leave, but Republicans only want to force women to give birth. After they do that, they don't care about the child or the mother. In fact, they seem to want to control who can get pregnant in the first place.

We must do everything we can to stop this extreme and unpopular Republican agenda.

CONGRATULATING LAUREN CURRY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lauren Curry on becoming the new Chief of Staff for Georgia Governor Brian Kemp.

Lauren has made history becoming the first woman to permanently hold this position after making history when she became the first female Deputy Chief of Staff to the Governor.

Lauren graduated with a bachelor's degree from Wofford College. She then pursued a master's degree from the University of Georgia. Her entire career has been dedicated to public service. She has held an array of impressive positions in State government, such as deputy director of Georgia's EPA division and director of Public and Governmental Affairs at the Georgia DNR.

Lauren is also a veteran of Governor Kemp's staff, having served as his chief operating officer and as his director of governmental affairs and policy.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Lauren, and I cannot think of anyone more deserving of this position.

REPUBLICAN WAR ON WOMEN

(Mr. LANDSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the efforts to undermine women and girls. The majority brought two bills forward that most Americans would reject.

One was a bill to protect misleading antiabortion pregnancy centers that aren't required to use actual medical professionals. The second restricts campuses from using literature that does anything other than encourage women to carry a pregnancy to term.

These were bad bills. Instead, I encourage my colleagues to support two bills that we will introduce next week. One, we want to prohibit funding for those pregnancy centers that mislead women and keep them from the medical care they need.

Two, we want colleges and universities to address the crisis of sexual assault on campus. Instead of requiring pamphlets to be passed out, they should require colleges and universities to report on sexual assaults and submit plans that would end this nightmare for women on campuses across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to end these efforts to undermine women and girls, and instead, pursue policies that empower and protect all those we serve.

PARENTAL SECRECY POLICY AT CHICO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, almost 1 year ago today, Aurora Regino of

Chico, California, sued the Chico Unified School District for trying to secretly socially transition her young daughter, alleging that a school counselor pressured her child to change her name and pronouns, dismissing the child's desire to inform her parents of the change.

Regino alleged that a parental secrecy policy is in place at Chico Unified and stipulated that the school district not disclose what was happening while her daughter was at school.

At first Chico Unified denied the existence of a parental secrecy policy, but later the school board actually voted 3-2 to publicly uphold it.

If that weren't bad enough, last week California Attorney General Rob Bonta led 16 attorneys general in filing an amicus brief in the U.S. Court of Appeals in support of Chico Unified's parental secrecy policy.

Shame on every single one of them for advocating for this horrible practice.

The child at the center of this case was subject to bullying by other children during her transition process. The counselor informed the child's teachers and peers of what was going on, but would not let the girl confer with her own parents while this was happening before announcing her new status to all the other kids.

She has since gone back and identified with her biological sex.

51ST ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 51st anniversary of Roe v. Wade. That decision, which recognized women's individual right to bodily autonomy, has now been supplanted by a Supreme Court that effectively said that the Federal Government isn't here to protect your individual rights because that is a States' rights issue now.

House Republicans, having cheered injecting States' rights into your individual private lives would now like to bring the Federal Government into the conversation.

If you don't believe me, Mr. Speaker, just look at what they are doing.

They passed legislation this term that would create a Federal prohibition against women who are serving in our military from traveling to get an abortion if they are stationed in a State that doesn't respect their individual rights.

They pushed legislation that would create a Federal prohibition on women from accessing medication abortion, even if that is legal in their State.

Nonetheless, here is the simple truth: The Republican Party with a big assist from a misogynistic Supreme Court took rights away from 167 million American women, granted them to States, and are now trying to take

those rights away and give them to the Federal Government.

Here is the truth: Abortion has never been a States' rights issue, and it has never been a Federal rights issue. It has always been a women's rights issue, and I hope that some day that is not partisan.

HOSTAGE IN GAZA—LIRI ALBAG

(Ms. STEVENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Liri Albag, one of the remaining hostages in Gaza.

This past Sunday marked the 100th day since Hamas terrorists brutally attacked Israel. There are still 136 innocent hostages who are experiencing the unimaginable. Terrorists carried out this atrocious attack, and terrorists are holding people like Liri against their will.

I want to start by sharing her story. She is 18 years old. Her friends and family describe her as having a heart of gold. Her mother and sister say she is a strong woman who enjoys exploring life, holding an optimistic perspective, and wants to see the world as a beautiful place.

Her life revolves around music and art, and she is a truly gifted young woman.

On October 7, Liri and 240 other innocent men, women, children, and elderly were violently kidnapped.

Liri needs to come home. She was working on an IDF base. It was her second day, and she was kidnapped. She was taken from us. So as this awful war goes on, we must continue to call for the release of these hostages. We cannot forget people like Liri.

RECOGNIZING THE PALMA HIGH SCHOOL CHIEFTAINS

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Palma High School Chieftains football team who recently won the California 4-A State championship.

While Palma High is no longer a part of my 19th Congressional District—I thank the redistricting commission—the Chieftains are definitely part of my memories. As a proud Carmel High Padre football player, I played against Palma all 4 years of my high school career, and, yes, I lost to Palma all 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, Palma is what you call a powerhouse when it comes to sports, especially in football, but they have never won a State championship until this year.

At the beginning of this season, it didn't even look like they were going to win sectionals as they started off going 0 and 5.

Nevertheless, typical Palma, led by Head Coach Jeff Carnazo, they always work hard, they always play smart, and, inevitably, they always win as they did over Mission Oaks High School in the State championship.

I congratulate Palma President, Chris Dalman, whom I played against back in high school, and who went on to play with the San Francisco 49ers and win a Super Bowl.

I congratulate the parents, the students, and, of course, the Chieftain football team on their State championship. They not only made the central coast proud, they made this former Padre very proud.

EXTREME REPUBLICANS' NATIONAL ABORTION BAN

(Ms. SCHRIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, once again, extreme Republicans are doubling down on their out-of-touch attacks on women as they renew their march toward a national abortion ban.

Today, they brought to the floor bills called the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act. They are two bills with great names and terrible policies.

The first stigmatizes students who seek abortion care. The second pulls money away from needy families in order to fund crisis pregnancy centers. These are sham centers that masquerade as clinics offering free pregnancy tests and ultrasounds, but they aren't. They often don't even have a healthcare provider and are designed specifically to dissuade women from considering abortion.

As a physician who has had these nonjudgmental conversations with my own patients, I am disgusted by this manipulation of women who think they are receiving legitimate medical care but are really just getting propaganda.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. This is the march toward a national abortion ban. Vote "no."

□ 1745

HEARTBREAK FOR THOSE WHO STRUGGLE TO GET PREGNANT

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, being a mother to my two children, Clay and Adrienne, is the greatest privilege of my life and my greatest joy. I often refer to them as the best thing I have ever done, and they are my rocks.

When I hear from women who so badly want to have children, but struggle with their fertility, it really makes me sad.

According to the CDC, infertility affects one in five women in the United States. In fact, it affected me, but I

have seen firsthand how heartbreaking and expensive struggling to conceive can be. I firmly believe as lawmakers that it is our duty to support these families, not to restrict their access to reproductive healthcare.

Everyone deserves access to the full range of assisted reproductive technologies to help them start or grow their families, including treatments like in vitro fertilization, or IVF. That is why I am so proud to join Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH today to introduce the Access to Family Building Act, which would codify the right to assisted reproduction technologies and ensure that no State law can infringe upon this right.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can all agree that we should support hopeful parents, and I call on my friends on both sides of the aisle to join me in bringing this legislation to the floor.

REMEMBERING HEROIC FIRE-FIGHTER STERLING "BUTCH" RAHE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of longtime heroic Ohio firefighter, Sterling "Butch" Rahe, who passed away on New Year's Day.

Butch served our community for over 30 years, three decades, as a firefighter in both Springfield Township and Toledo, most recently acting as the public face of the Toledo Fire and Rescue Department, which is a really hard job.

Former Toledo Fire Chief Brian Byrd said: The fact that Butch loved the people he served and the people with whom he served is indisputable. We all thank him.

Springfield Township Fire Chief Barry Cousino said: He was a fireman's fireman. He loved what he did. Whenever he got in the public, he always treated people with respect and treated them like family.

In fitting tribute, his homegoing procession made stops by Springfield Township Fire Station 51 and Toledo Fire Station 17, where he served, for one final good-bye with crowds gathered on both sides of the street to pay their respects as the procession went by.

Mr. Speaker, I offer fitting tribute and a community-wide deep thank you for his service. He will truly be missed. Every grateful person and family he assisted will remember him by his countless acts of mercy and love.

FEEDING THE CHILDREN OF TEXAS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank President Joseph Biden

and Vice President Kamala Harris for working with those of us who have a deep abiding concern for our children.

I chair the Congressional Children's Caucus, and I was delighted that we were able to provide for the summer feeding youth program that will provide breakfast, lunch, and dinner for our children in the summer when they are not on a program that is held during the school year.

This is a vital program. It is a program that simply has the opportunity for our State to match and the Federal Government then matches and provides hungry children a lifeline.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking publicly for the State of Texas to accept the summer feeding program and to be one of the 35 States that have already accepted this program to participate in, so that the 3 million children in the State of Texas, and the nearly 100,000 in my congressional district, and possibly 1 million in the region that I represent would have the ability to eat.

Don't you want our children of Texas to eat? Let us participate in the summer feeding program. Let's do it now.

FAREWELL SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE BILL JOHNSON OF OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUARTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with a bittersweet message for my colleagues.

After more than a dozen years here in the House of Representatives, I am retiring/resigning this week.

I have so loved this work. It has been the honor of a lifetime to serve the good people of eastern and southeastern Ohio.

To many, the people I represent are just the flown-over or flyover country, but they are truly so much more.

From Youngstown to Portsmouth, to St. Clairsville to Zanesville, these are people who care deeply. They are hard-working men and women, with strong values and a proud legacy of doing the hard things that keep America moving forward—mining coal, making steel, and producing oil and natural gas. So often they do it with the deck stacked against them, mocked by political elites who wish they would simply go away.

Leaving Washington, believe me, will be easy, but leaving my job, representing these fine folks, is hard.

I hear a new call. It is a call to help prepare the next generation of American leaders. I will be doing it at one of our country's finest public institutions of higher learning, Youngstown State University.

It took a unique offer for me to leave the people's House, but becoming presi-

dent of Youngstown State is a challenge I felt I must accept.

Working with our young people to shape the future excites me and gives me hope and zeal for the work ahead.

This brings me to my main message today. It might seem out of step in today's culture, but it is something everyone must hear. The message is simple: America is exceptional.

The Founding Fathers knew it, and on July 4, 1776, when they declared it out loud, the rest of the world soon found out that it was true also. They knew it, too.

Those men laid down a bedrock foundation on the principles of personal liberty, free enterprise, and a representative government accountable to the people. It is, without a doubt, the greatest government ever created in the history of humanity.

Now, my life has been a constant journey to serve my country, from my 26-plus years in the United States Air Force to this journey of servicing Congress and into my next chapter leading one of Ohio's finest universities.

My commitment to service is because of the debt of gratitude that I owe. I grew up poor, but this country has given me the opportunity to prosper.

I have lived the American Dream, and that has kindled optimism in my heart.

Sure, I know that watching the news or reading comments on the internet today can be depressing, but I truly don't believe these divisions that are rocking our Nation today will hold.

That is because deep down we all want the same thing here in America—peace, freedom, and the ability to pursue the American Dream on our own terms and to build a life. We mustn't let voices of anger shred our American sense of self.

In President George Washington's farewell address, he encouraged his countrymen to recognize and enjoy the fruits of the new Constitution and national government that fostered liberty and opportunity.

His message resonates down through the generations even today. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, we all enjoy the same liberty. Liberal, moderates, and conservatives, we all have the same opportunities.

These are our common threads. Let's strengthen the fabric that binds us together. We can disagree without dissolving that bond. Indeed, that is the only way forward.

My new workplace will be a university campus, which is an ideal place for disagreements and debate to happen in a way that is civil and educational. We should and we will foster discussion even if the result is merely acceptance of differing views.

That is what George Washington and our Founders fought for, and it is the ideal that makes America different and better than other countries. It is one of the many reasons America is exceptional.

For that, I am most thankful.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention just a few people for whom I am also thankful.

It would be impossible to list everyone standing here today. I don't have but 60 minutes, and it would take far longer than that, but know that you are in my thoughts of appreciation as I close one chapter and prepare to open another.

First to my staff, past and present, led by chief of staff Mike Smullen and district director Sarah Keeler. I know that there is no more hardworking team here, working not for me, but working on behalf of the people of eastern and southeastern Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my staff Mike, Sarah, and the rest of the team. I could not have done it without them.

I also thank my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle with whom I have developed lifelong friendships, the likes of which can only be forged in the trenches of hard work and service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my campaign team that has stayed remarkably intact since the early days in 2009 when we sat around a kitchen table to discuss running for Congress. I thank them all.

I offer a resounding thank you to the voters of eastern and southeastern Ohio for supporting me across multiple districts that has seen us represent 19 different counties in different configurations over the last 13 years.

Servicing Congress is a sacrifice, both for us as Members and for those around us as well—our families.

Mr. Speaker, I end here by thanking my children—Josh, Julie, Jessica, and Nathan, and my extended family for putting up with the crazy session schedules and helping me during this journey when I missed so many of our family activities and couldn't be there.

Lastly, and most importantly, to my wife, LeeAnn. She would have been in the gallery today, but it is cold outside. I have always said from the day we met, the first time that I laid eyes on you, you have made me a better man, a better human being. You have sacrificed more than anyone else, and it was you that made all of this possible by being my loving partner and standing by me in some of the toughest times. I couldn't have done it without you by my side. Thank you, LeeAnn, the love of my life.

Mr. Speaker, thank you, and farewell.

I say for the last time, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

GOVERNMENT FUNDING AND IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

We appreciate him. I played with him on the baseball team. He was the catcher, and we will miss his catching abilities. God bless him in his future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. I, too, wish our friend from Ohio well in his future endeavors and appreciated serving with him in the Chamber and appreciate the same sacrifices with respect to our family, our children, and our wives when we are here traveling and the things that we miss out on. I do wish him well.

Today, in the House of Representatives, we voted by suspension of the rules what is called a continuing resolution to continue the funding of government at its current levels. Now, that is just another way in D.C.-speak of saying we aren't doing our job to pass appropriations bills through what we call regular order, the way that you would expect us to do it, send it to the Senate, negotiate back and forth, and then take that and do our job to do the work of the people on how we spend their money.

Last year, we set out to change the way the House works, the gentleman from Arizona knows. We made some progress actually. I had hope. We had moved in the right direction. We passed 10 appropriations of 12 out of committee. We had two ready to go. Seven we passed off the floor of the House.

We passed them not at the level I would prefer—a lower level—but we did pass them at the agreed-upon level last year under the FRA, the debt deal that capped spending. Again, we should have capped it a lot lower. It represented a mere 1 percent cut from last year's bloated level of spending under Speaker NANCY PELOSI passed at the eleventh hour in December of 2022.

Every member of the Republican Conference here today except for two opposed that bill, voted against that omnibus spending bill. They spoke out against it and put out press releases against it. They said that it was enormously expensive, adding up to our debt, passing policies we didn't agree on, done at the eleventh hour right before Christmas. There was massive opposition. Only two in this Chamber on the Republican side voted for it.

Fast forward. Last year, a deal was made and caps were put in place. We got our appropriations bills sent over to the Senate trying to do it at those levels, even though it was a mere just 1 percent cut. I would like to see a 10 percent or 20 percent cut. We wanted to get to pre-COVID spending levels, but this body on a bipartisan basis—a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats—sent to the Senate a debt deal, lifting the debt \$4 trillion. For that, we were supposed to get a 1 percent cut.

Then there is something in this town called side deals.

Does that sound swampy? It is.

There were side deals, agreements saying, no, no, no, that won't be the real deal.

Do you know how I know that? Because the Democratic ranking member on the Appropriations Committee appeared before the Rules Committee about a month ago and said: Well, I voted against the FRA, the debt deal, because the side deals weren't written in it.

Now, she only admitted that after she had said you are not following the law. I said: Well, where in the law are the side deals? Oh, well, they are not in the law. In fact, in her public statement last year, she voted against it and said: I voted against it because they weren't in the law.

Yet today, Senate Democrats and House Republicans were negotiating spending at the level of not the caps, but the caps plus the side deals. That is to say, in plain English, PELOSI spending levels plus another \$30 to \$40 billion. That is what is happening in the swamp.

However, they couldn't get it done. They couldn't get it done fast enough. So here we are again after we have twice extended NANCY PELOSI's spending levels without getting the appropriations bills done, not getting our job done, not getting the work finished, and today we just agreed—the Senate sent over here another continuing resolution to fund government at NANCY PELOSI's levels, and we concurred in that.

Now, it is not just the debt. It is not just the spending. It is not just the fact that we are \$34 trillion in debt. It is what we are funding. It is the policies we are continuing. That is the problem.

Here are just a few. The continuing resolution that we just voted for, a near perfect divide down the Republican Conference, 107 to 106. House leadership had to scurry around to whip up the votes to ensure a majority of Republicans supported this terrible bill.

What did we fund? Again, spending at the level of \$1.6-something trillion, NANCY PELOSI's levels, we funded Biden's border crisis while we are currently trying to impeach the Secretary of Homeland Security for failing to secure the border, ignoring his duty to maintain operational control and endangering Americans. Fentanyl is pouring in. We are empowering China, empowering cartels. He lied to us under oath. We are giving him the money. Let's impeach him, but let's keep giving him the money.

A weaponized IRS, an Internal Revenue Service targeting the American people.

A weaponized Department of Justice and FBI that targeted Scott Smith in Loudoun County and Mark Houck, a dad in Philadelphia. Give them the money. Build them a brand-new headquarters. Give them the money.

EPA, electric vehicle mandates. We are piling up electric vehicles on the lots of car dealerships around the country. We have a mandate going into

place to mandate two-thirds of all vehicles will be EVs by 2032, which will massively create inflation for the American people, make goods and services more expensive, and make getting cars more difficult.

The average electric vehicle is about \$16,000 more expensive, and where the heck are you going to charge it? The Governor of California actually told people with EVs recently: Please don't plug in your EVs between the hours of 4 and 8 o'clock.

What are you supposed to do if you can't take your car to go to your job?

EPA rules killing coal and natural gas power plants. China has got 1,100 coal-fired plants. We have 250. We are building none; they are building two a week. We are going to kill our own power supply chasing unicorn energy policies. But guess what, we are funding it. Every Republican in this Chamber who campaigns against these things just voted today to fund it.

The World Health Organization, anybody think that is doing us any good besides getting us involved with anti-American sovereignty and undermining our own ability to maintain health policy and our national security? We are funding it.

We are funding the pro-China, anti-Israel United Nations Human Rights Council. We are funding UNRWA, through which dollars flow to the Palestinians—that is Hamas; that is the enemies of Israel. We are going around saying: “We stand with Israel.”

How many Republicans wear the little pins, “We stand with Israel”? They are funding opposition to Israel.

ATF rule banning pistol braces. Unconstitutional, unlawful, executive tyranny, not getting congressional approval. We are funding it.

Over here, we are funding the Department of Education's student loan scam. The Supreme Court says you can't do that. The administration does it anyway. Lawlessly. We are saying: Here you go, here's more money.

We are funding the CDC, the NIH, and the FDA. No accountability for COVID tyranny, no restrictions.

We are funding the Department of Veterans Affairs vaccine mandate. I introduced legislation today to say we shouldn't do that. We should get rid of that mandate. We are funding it.

We are funding the chief diversity officers, DEI, critical race theory at the Pentagon and throughout the Federal Government.

The Pentagon's abortion travel fund, transgender surgeries at the Pentagon, funding sex changes.

I could go on and on the number of things that we are funding, but I want to be mindful of my colleague's time.

I will end by going back to the border crisis because it is the number one thing that galls me that Republicans complain about and continue to fund. Our borders are wide open. Our people are in danger. It undermines our national security. Texas and Arizona take it on the chin. We are spending

the money to do what the Federal Government is supposed to do. Our people are getting absolutely decimated.

Ranchers are getting killed. Livestock are getting out. Children are dying from fentanyl. Cops are having to go do the job of the Feds. Migrants are dying, dying in the river, in the Rio Grande, dying along the border in Arizona, and we are funding it.

I just don't understand the logic of my colleagues campaigning about these things. I will close with this: Federalist 58, the Founders gave us the power of the purse in the House Chamber to stop an out-of-control executive branch. We should dang well use it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I appreciate his very prescient comments. Before I get on too much more, I have a bill that pulls us out of the World Health Organization. I would encourage all of my colleagues to sign it.

If you watched the head of the World Health Organization, Dr. Tedros, today speaking at the World Economic Forum, they are planning to use the next epidemic to impose world governance. I mean, he basically said that. I invite you to watch that. That is the head of the World Health Organization.

Let's talk about what my good friend from Texas talked about. He has been a leader on this issue, and we have both been fighting this for some time. That is border security. I can't help but recall the words of President Biden, who was then a candidate for the Presidency, and he was asked in the debate on the Democrat side, they said: What do you tell people at the border? He said: I would urge them to surge to the border if he became President.

There is a reason that in the Zocalo of Tijuana people had T-shirts on saying: Joe Biden, let me in. The reason is because he said he would. There is a reason that the first month after Joe Biden issued I believe it was 90 executive orders undoing the border policy of the Trump administration on the first 24 hours, by the way, that you had the first record of border crossings or these encounters, and that was 150,000. Think about that, 150,000.

Our minds were blown. Wow, we were saying, that is more than 5,000 a day, a little over 5,000 a day for that, that is incredible. Then the next month was more, February was more. March of 2021 exceeded that. Record after record after record until we end up last month with 302,000 encounters.

You begin looking at it and you say, well, how does this happen? Is it just policy?

I used to think it was incompetence. I really did. That is giving them the benefit of the doubt. I thought after the first three months in a row of records, they are just incompetent, they don't quite know what they are doing. Then we got to meet Secretary Mayorkas, he finally came in and he testified. At first, before he testified, he came into the Border Security Caucus and talked to us there, and he said: The border is secure.

□ 1815

Now, mind you, just on the encounters alone for that first 3 months, you were pushing 430,000. For known got-aways, you were pushing about an additional 110,000. Unknown got-aways are estimated to be at least another 75,000. So, you have 600,000-plus illegal border crossings in his first 3 months that he was running DHS, and he sat there and told us that the border was secure and that we have operational control.

I will remember when my colleague asked him: Do you have operational control pursuant to the Secure Fence Act of 2006? He said yes.

Then we got the language out. I think Mr. ROY got the language out and said: Let's read the language.

He still insisted. He knew that they were not in compliance with the law. He knew it. Yet, he persists to craft a narrative that the border is secure.

Of course, it is not secure, which is why you had about 450,000 people enter our country illegally last month.

I am suggesting to America that this country cannot take 12 more months of the Mayorkas security plan on the border because 12 more months would be over 5 million people getting into this country illegally.

What is happening now is they are releasing approximately 80 percent of everyone who comes in. They release them into the country.

I was in Lukeville the week before Christmas. Lukeville is the hub right now and has been. Over a 2-week period, they had 30,000 people come through Lukeville—nowhere else, Lukeville.

I was down there in the heart of that, and I was allowed to talk to people who had not been formally arrested yet. I would go up and ask them: Where are you from? Where are you going? Why did you come? Those were my three questions.

We had the gentlemen from Burkina Faso, another few from Senegal, and another few from Guinea. Those are all African nations.

Then, we had folks from India and Pakistan. That is South Asia, India and South Asia. Pakistan is considered to be the Middle East, although in my mind, they are still South Asia. That is interesting.

Of course, we always have some folks from Guatemala.

You have to understand where Lukeville is. The reason that you have a port of entry there is because it is on kind of a highway that goes from Phoenix, from Ajo, down to a place called Rocky Point, Mexico, which is on the Sea of Cortez. People go down there and recreate down there.

When we asked them where they are going, why they are here, I would say: Where are you going? Everyone that I asked starts fiddling around in their backpacks and pockets, and they pull out a card. On that card will be two or three names with phone numbers and an address somewhere in the country. It is laminated. It is not like this. This is not laminated. Theirs are laminated.

I said: Where are you going? We have a guy going to the Bronx. We have people going to Missouri, Oklahoma, Houston.

If you are going to Houston, why are you crossing into Lukeville? You should have been over in Del Rio or RGV. I don't know why you are here. When you ask them that, it is because they were directed to come there. The coyotes, the cartels, tell them this is where you are going to go, where you are going to come in.

They release them, and they are in good shape. They are in good shape. They haven't walked. They haven't come through the Darien Gap in Panama. Those folks are the folks that are ending up over in Del Rio or Eagle Pass right now.

Those coming to Lukeville, they have flown into Mexico. They have been bused up. They get bused.

How did you get here? Well, we came in from—there is a gap in the gate, in the fence down here.

The border wall that President Trump put up 30 feet high, just on the other side going down to the Sea of Cortez, like I told you, there is a free-way. The cartels will come up and run a real quick couple of cuts. They will remove two slats from the fence, pull them down, and just start flooding people through.

I talked to the guy who repairs them. That morning, in about 4 hours' time, they had already repaired six breaches.

I tell you these things so you understand how real this is. Our lever as Members of Congress is the purse strings. We are not going to have success with just policy because this is a lawless administration. We have to have enforcement as a condition of funding this government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

The gentleman is from a border State, but, Mr. Speaker, it is true that every State is now a border State. Our communities are being deluged with individuals who are in this country illegally. That is the bottom line. Every community realizes it.

I had the opportunity to go with Speaker Johnson to Eagle Pass. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, it was eye-opening. It was eye-opening because, as you know, right now, as we are standing here on the floor today, the Biden Department of Justice is literally suing the Texas Department of Public Safety because Texas actually wants to defend the border. Yes, you heard that right.

The President, who comes out of the meeting yesterday with the Speaker and the leaders over in the House and the Senate and says, oh, we have to do something about the border, yes, he is doing something about it. He sent his lawyers into court to actually tell the Texas department to stand down from defending our border. Those are the facts. I was there.

We got briefed by the directors of the Texas Department of Public Safety, who will tell you that, yes, in fact, they watched the Border Patrol—look, great men and women. They raised their hands and said they were going to obey what their orders were. They are functioning as social workers. That is it. They will tell you.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most revealing facts was the day when they had 6,000 people come to Eagle Pass. We stood in the facility. They will tell you that this facility was originally designed to process about 100 people a day, maybe 200.

It is not a permanent facility, by the way. It is a soft-sided facility. It is a tent. They had to do it that way because nobody could have projected that we were going to process thousands of people a day.

They said, well, we expanded it and can process about 1,000 people a day. What happens when 6,000 people cross the border, and this administration doesn't turn them back, doesn't have a return to Mexico policy?

By the way, just to review the geography, the day we were there, the people who were crossing the border, who were wading through the Rio Grande, were young Venezuelan men. Just to review the geography, I doubt they swam from Venezuela up the Rio Grande, which means they had to come by land and had to pass through all the countries of Central America and then Mexico to get to the United States.

They were claiming asylum, or they could have been paroled into the interior. I don't know. I don't know how Border Patrol handled them, but Border Patrol was not turning them back.

They will tell you that most of the people who come claim asylum. They said it was like 80 percent of the people are claiming asylum. They know the magic words to say. They come to the border and say that they face some kind of persecution and threats of violence in their country and are claiming asylum.

They will also tell you that a large number of those people are actually coming from Mexico. It is not the most now. Most are from Venezuela, but number two is Mexico.

Picture this, Mr. Speaker. We have a trade agreement with Mexico. We have a peaceful border with Mexico—at least with the Mexican Government, not with the cartels. Yet, we are accepting people who are telling us they have to be here on asylum from our neighboring ally, Mexico.

How ridiculous is that? There is no civil war going on in Mexico. There is none of that. Why in the world would we be taking asylum cases from Mexico?

The Texas border people said that the problem is that Border Patrol—and confirmed by Border Patrol—are instructed to process these people into the interior.

Mr. Speaker, when those 6,000 people crossed the border, they took all the

Border Patrol agents from 243 miles of border that the Eagle Pass-Del Rio sector is responsible for—they took them all into the 4 miles of that area around Eagle Pass, leaving 239 miles of Texas border wide open.

The administration will tell you all the fentanyl is crossing at the ports of entry. Really? On a day when 239 miles are unpatrolled, you think that a few pounds of fentanyl worth millions of dollars that could kill tens of millions of people—you think that they are going to risk taking it through a port of entry when the border is wide open? It is not believable.

This administration does not want to enforce the border. They don't care about 70,000 people dying from fentanyl every year and that number going up, not down.

We can't stand for it anymore. The gentleman from Arizona is absolutely right. Our lever is funding. We ought to take advantage of that.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as our colleague, our good friend from Maryland, just noted, this administration claims they don't have the resources or manpower to secure the border because MAGA Republicans, conservative Republicans, haven't given him those resources. Yet, as Texas has tried to stand in the gap and do the job that the Federal Government won't do, they are suing and fighting, literally trying to prevent Texas from securing the border.

Just yesterday, we had 14 Democrats vote with every Republican to condemn, denounce, and call for an end to the President's open-border policies, the President's border invasion. We then had the opportunity to try to attach border security today to the government funding bill, to use the leverage of the government funding to secure the border.

I saw a poll today that shows a majority of registered voters—not Republicans, mind you, but a majority of registered voters—support shutting down the government in order to secure the border. Yet, we voted today to continue to give billions of dollars to Secretary Mayorkas to continue to facilitate the border invasion and, frankly, to give millions of dollars to the U.N., which is literally using the resources we gave them to coach illegals on how to cheat our asylum system.

We must not even consider the Mayorkas-Lankford deal, which is worse than doing nothing. It is worse than doing nothing to give the false sense of border security to give political cover to those who are literally facilitating the border invasion, those who would call it a good border deal to allow 5,000 illegals a day before they start to try to prevent those above 5,000; to put no limits on parole, which would allow Mayorkas to allow anyone else he wants to illegally come into our country; and to give work permits to

those who are here illegally now. That is literally worse than nothing.

The American people deserve nothing less than genuine, true border security, and we ought to have the resolve to deliver that for them.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out really quickly, on parole, which my colleague mentioned, parole by statute is meant to be a case-by-case humanitarian administrative remedy. This administration has granted parole to more than a million people.

What parole does is it actually gives you a work permit. You are supposed to be here. You have a relative that needs surgery. You are going to be here for 2 weeks. Extraordinarily, before Biden, it was about 15 a year. In this administration, it is over a million.

I also want to talk about CBP because those line agents are working their tails off. They are doing everything they can, but they are being undermined by Secretary Mayorkas and this administration.

I have been down there many times and talked to them. Their morale is so low. They want to enforce, but like in Eagle Pass and Lukeville, both places I have been, once you get away from the crowd where they are processing, you can drive along the border for miles. We drove along Lukeville literally for miles.

The only people we saw was the guy in charge of rebuilding the fence and the hundreds of people that were walking along the border road who had come through those holes illegally.

We need to use our lever that our Founders gave to us. It is the most effective. I urge our colleagues to reconsider, as we go forward, using that lever to prevent this administration from avoiding its duty to enforce our border security.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1830

OUR SOUTHWEST BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who were just on the floor discussing one of the biggest challenges that we face in this country, which is having a secure southwest border. It is, in fact, a national security problem and a homeland security problem, and it is the Biden's own policies that have caused this to happen.

This avalanche of humanity at our border that is a colossal challenge to our Nation is due to specific decisions

taken by President Joe Biden and his lack of leadership to recognize it is a disaster. Then to do nothing about it, compounds it.

Since President Biden took office, there have been 7.1 million known border crossings across our southwest border; almost a million got-aways, these are people that we don't know that crossed the border.

In December, as my colleagues noted, a record 300,000 migrants were apprehended at the border. Yet, President Biden has still not agreed to work with Congress to solve this problem. Mr. Speaker, 300,000 in one month; never before have we seen numbers like that in 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I went down to the border a few days ago with our new Speaker MIKE JOHNSON. Over 50 of my colleagues were on that trip to Eagle Pass. That was my eighth trip to the border, which is about eight times more than Joe Biden has been to the border in 50 years of public service.

While there, we saw a group of Venezuelans come across the border illegally to the United States right in front of the new Speaker of the House as he was meeting with Texas Department of Public Safety.

Now, I can promise you, despite Secretary Mayorkas saying that the Biden administration has operational control of the border, that is nonsense. It passes no smell test of any practical commonsense American to think that you could say, with 300,000 people interdicted in one month, that we have operational control.

President Trump inherited an open border from President Obama, but through many tough choices, over 4 years of trial and error and several homeland security secretaries, he got a strategy that began to work.

It was President Biden on January 20, 2021, that threw those working policies away. Now, we have an avalanche of fentanyl coming across our border, an avalanche of human trafficking, and kids being trafficked across our border.

Over 300,000 people since the President has been in office that are on the terror watch list have crossed the border. Let that sink in.

What happened to them? How many people came across the border on the terror watch list that we did not catch.

As has been said, we have challenges: Criminal cartels making billions, not from selling drugs to our citizens, but criminal cartels making billions trafficking people across our border.

As we were told by the FBI in this House last month, this is the most serious moment for America since 2014, and some argue since 9/11, for the risk of a terror attack in our country. Yet, we don't have a secure border. This is why we passed H.R. 2 across this House floor, with Republican support, and sent it to the Senate, where it sits since last May, Mr. Speaker.

The President of the United States and the Senate have known the views of this body in detail about what immi-

gration policies we would change, what funding we would apply, and what border security ideas we have. They are all in H.R. 2. Yet, there has been no action by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friends. Although, I am not sure that we have a lot to look forward to, I am an optimist.

President Biden told the Speaker yesterday: No, I want to change policy on the border. I want to work with Congress on a border solution.

Bring it on. We want to see it.

So as an optimist, I hope that when we come back to this House one week from now that, in fact, we see a deal that is something that House Republicans can support that is not lip service but true border security and immigration reform.

NOA MARCIANO—ISRAELI HOSTAGE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Corporal Noa Marciano.

On October 7, Corporal Noa Marciano was one of more than 240 men, women, children, and elderly who were brutally kidnapped by Hamas terrorists as they stormed across the border from Gaza into Israel.

Noa was a corporal in the Border Defense Corps' 414th unit. She was serving as an observation soldier at the Nahal Oz IDF base in southern Israel, just about a kilometer from the Gaza border. Her position was overrun.

Most of her unit soldiers were female, and they were not provided a sidearm or a rifle to defend themselves. Their duty was to monitor the border with Gaza.

On November 13, Hamas terrorists produced a video showing Corporal Marciano's dead body. She was 19 years old, Mr. Speaker.

Last November, in our candlelight vigil on the House steps, I met with Noa's mom, Adi, as we prayed together for her daughter and all the hostages wrongly held by Hamas. It was just the next day that she learned her daughter was not a hostage but a victim of murder by Hamas. That is sick.

Her family describes Noa as a girl who loved to dance, and sing, enjoyed music and literature, and whose dimples and smile radiated love.

My heart breaks for Adi and her family. No family should have to experience this kind of loss due to the reprehensible actions of terrorists.

We know how they feel in this country. We remember viscerally the pain and suffering, murder and mayhem, dust, smell, and smoke of 9/11.

We know how her family feels.

Sadly, while Noa can no longer be released, we remember her and her courage in her defense of the homeland.

I stand here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, demanding that Hamas release all the remaining hostages. Those who have been fortunately released have shared their horrifying experience in captivity, something that they will never forget. America must stand unequivocally with Israel as it works to

defeat this terror onslaught and free its citizens wrongfully held by Hamas.

Israel has proven its willingness to pause the fighting for hostages to be returned home. Despicably, the terror group broke that first hostage deal just as the cease-fire was being put in place.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all nations, all allies, all friends of Israel, and all those nations that have ties with this murderous terror group to press Hamas' leaders to cease military action and free those in captivity.

TAIWAN ELECTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, last week, the people of Taiwan went to the polls and elected the Democratic Progressive Party, the DDP Presidential candidate, President Lai, to be the next President of Taiwan. President-elect Lai will serve along with his Vice President, Vice President-elect Hsiao Bi-khim, who had a distinguished recognition here in Washington as Taiwan's diplomatic representative to America's Capital.

This successful election signals to the Chinese Communist Party leadership that Taiwanese want to remain friendly, trading neighbors, but independent of the CCP and China.

Although China has claimed it would not invade Taiwan, CCP Leader Xi has more openly stated of late that China will one day unify with Taiwan and has not reiterated taking force off the table.

I met with President-elect Lai while on a visit to Taipei with House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman McCAUL, and I know his desire for peace on the Taiwan Strait, the preservation of democracy and liberty on Taiwan, and an openness with all the countries of the world.

In my view, the United States' mission and the job of all freedom-loving nations is to continue to support Taiwan in strengthening their security and countering the CCP's aggression in a military fashion toward the island.

Let's let the people of Taiwan continue, as they have for five decades, the recent decades, to live in peace, democracy, and prosperity.

MILKEN INSTITUTE HBCU FELLOWS 2024 COHORT LAUNCH

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and thank the Milken Institute here in Washington, D.C., for this week's HBCU Cohort Reception, where they gathered to celebrate and welcome their second historically Black colleges and universities Strategic Initiative and Fellowship Program.

I thank them for their leadership, and I congratulate these 20 impressive students that the Milken Institute has sponsored and identified from 12 different HBCUs across the country.

Since I came to Congress, I have been an active member of the bipartisan, bicameral, Historically Black College and University Caucus. Before I came to Congress, I was very active with the Arkansas historically Black colleges and universities community, working mightily as a community banker with

Arkansas Baptist College in Little Rock.

My work with ABC was impactful and meaningful, and I recognize their incredible contributions to both education and economic growth in my hometown of Little Rock by working with their students.

Since I have been in Congress, I have advocated for HBCU growth and development, and along with Arkansas Baptist, I am proud to represent Philander Smith University and Shorter College.

I would particularly give a shout-out to one of those 20 students, Mr. Speaker. Justin Woods is a senior at Philander Smith, and Justin was selected by Milken to be part of this cohort, and I congratulate him.

I thank my co-chair of the HBCU Caucus, ALMA ADAMS of North Carolina, and thank her for continuing to work together for Federal policy that aids our very important HBCUs, and I thank the Milken Institute for their continued leadership.

KVRE/TOM NICHOLS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, since 1958, my good friend, Tom Nichols, has been an impactful voice for many Arkansans.

This past November, Tom completed 65 years of broadcasting, an extraordinary accomplishment. His station, KVRE or 92.9 FM in Hot Springs, Arkansas, is family-owned and operated by Tom, and now his daughter, Alice.

Sadly, KVRE is only one of the few family-owned radio stations left in Arkansas, and it has a great audience of over 600,000 Arkansans. Their station is celebrating 30 years this year; also a remarkable milestone.

Tom and Alice are dedicated to ensuring that Arkansans are informed, while providing daily entertainment. In a world where media outlets are frequently corporately owned, it is terrific to recognize a local, family-owned, and independently operated radio station.

□ 1845

I congratulate KVRE for 30 years on the air and Tom for 65 years of broadcasting. My thanks to the Nichols family for their dedication to the communities they serve over the air. I look forward to many years ahead of their success.

CONGRATULATING DON WALKER

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Don Walker on his retirement from Arvest Bank. Don spent the past four decades in the banking industry, with most of that spent making major strategic decisions at Arvest, including helping craft their own corporate name, Arvest.

During his tenure, he served as president and CEO of their expansion business in Tulsa, Oklahoma, which became one of their largest and most successful markets in their company. Don is known for not only being a great business leader and banker but for being a friend to many in northwest Arkansas and throughout our State.

I applaud my friend Don Walker on his impressive career and wish him a very happy retirement.

CONGRATULATING THE HARDING UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the House floor to congratulate the Harding University football team for winning the NCAA Division II Football National Championship. That is right, a national championship from Arkansas.

The Bisons wrapped up an undefeated season, going 15-0, while only completing 26 passes all year. This team was a running machine. They found success by running the ball and racking up 6,300 rushing yards for the season.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in college football history that a team has rushed more than 6,000 yards in a season.

I congratulate head coach Paul Simmons and his exceptional team on their incredible achievement and hard work, and I really look forward to the team building on this success in their next season.

Go Bisons.

CONGRATULATING KATHY WEBB

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kathy Webb on her retirement from the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance.

Kathy served as the CEO of Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance for the past 12 years while simultaneously also representing Ward 3 on the City of Little Rock Board of Directors.

During her time as CEO, Kathy expanded access to food across our region and our State, creating new partnerships to fight hunger and improve public policy at both the State and the Federal level.

She was a real leader in our community as the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted work and food access. She will now carry out a 2-year term as vice mayor of Little Rock and work as a consultant on a variety of issues in central Arkansas.

I congratulate Kathy for her outstanding leadership and work on combating hunger. I wish her a happy retirement from this mission, and I look forward to my continued work with her on issues of mutual concern in our city.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CARSON DELONG

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Carson DeLong, a fifth grader from The Baptist Preparatory School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

At such a young age, Carson has become the embodiment of kindness and giving for many this season.

Starting in his own classroom, Carson aimed to donate 50 pairs of socks to the homeless in central Arkansas. As his sock drive grew, he ended up collecting 500 pairs.

Arkansas has a homeless population of approximately 2,500 people, but because of Carson's passion, his commitment, and his love for everybody, some

of those will have a much warmer winter.

Even amongst his newfound fame, Carson remains humble and attributed much of this feat and success to his classmates. His class has started another drive for other pieces of clothing, and Carson says he is happy just knowing that he could help start this cycle of generosity.

Carson is not done yet, as he started a new drive that collects teddy bears and stuffed animals, and he hopes to donate that to the patients at our outstanding Arkansas Children's Hospital.

His kindness shines through, and I am looking forward to the future of this fine young man.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPRESSIVE CAREER OF
RANDY HANKINS A/K/A CRAIG O'NEILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the impressive career of Randy Hankins, a/k/a the beloved Craig O'Neill, who, after 50 years of working as a news anchor and radio DJ, retired at the end of 2023.

Craig has spent the best part of 24 years of his career working as a broadcaster on Little Rock's KTHV Channel 11, and I was really amused and happy as I watched the great tribute they delivered for him on his last sign off on December 29.

Craig's career includes accolades and awards, including a regional Emmy, the prestigious Edward R. Murrow Lifetime Achievement Award in Broadcast Journalism, and Craig was inducted into The National Academy of Television Arts this past year.

Randy and his wife, Jane, are devoted to Arkansas. They have helped raise millions of dollars for charities and community causes, and they have delivered decades of laughter to all of us in central Arkansas.

On behalf of the people of Arkansas, I thank Randy for his years of service, love, and humor in the community as he prepares for his well-deserved retirement.

HONORING MRS. ELNORA CRANFORD

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor World War II veteran and Arkansas native Mrs. Elnora Cranford who celebrated her 100th birthday on December 20.

Elnora's call to service began long before joining the Women's Army Corps. Prior to service, she worked at the Jacksonville ordnance plant as a detonator assembler in Jacksonville, Arkansas.

She joined the Women's Army Corps in 1944 and served honorably, receiving medals including the Good Conduct Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, and the American Theater Service Medal. She earned the rank of corporal before she separated from the service in 1946.

After her separation, Elnora, a second generation Arkansan, married Robert Cranford, who began his service in World War II, as well. They were married for 56 years and have two daughters, Glenda and Judy.

For over 25 years, they were the owners of Earl's Cafe in North Little Rock, Arkansas.

I thank Elnora Cranford for her service, her love of life, her family, and I congratulate her on her 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING ELI PALADINO

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Eli Paladino of Morrilton, Arkansas.

During the most recent Christmas season, Eli hosted a toy drive fundraiser for the kids at Arkansas Children's Hospital, the same hospital where he receives his care for his congenital heart defect.

A sixth grader at Sacred Heart School, Eli got the idea for a fundraiser from how happy the toys made him the previous year, and he told his mom that he wanted to host a fundraiser the following Christmas.

With an initial goal of raising \$300, he has raised over \$2,000 from family, friends, and the community for his toy drive. Eli now wants to work in the hospital when he grows up, because the employees there make the kids feel so happy.

I commend Eli and his family for their successful toy drive and for creating countless memories for those kids who have to spend some time in a very caring place, but away from home, our Arkansas Children's Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2872. An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT
RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 38—A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to "Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Charger".

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Monday, January 22, 2024.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 22, 2024, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2940. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-362, "Minimum Wage Clarification Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2941. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-363, "Golden Triangle Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2942. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-364, "Friendship Heights Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2943. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-357, "Adjustment of Building Restriction Line in Square 2950 along the southern side of Fern Street, NW, S.O. 23-06301 Temporary Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2944. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-365, "Jeanette A. Michael Way Designation Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2945. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-358, "Green Housing Transition Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2946. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-366, "Gordon Way Designation Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2947. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-359, "Hotel Enhanced Cleaning and Notice of Service Disruption Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2948. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-360, "Fidelity in Access to Government Communications Clarification Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-2949. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-361, "Retired Firefighter and Police Officer Redeployment Temporary Amendment Act of 2023", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to certain organizations for members

of the Armed Forces, with an amendment (Rept. 118-351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3372. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a safety data collection program for certain 6-axle vehicles, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the differentiation between mead and low alcohol by volume wine for purposes of the tax imposed on wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 7030. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to periodically review final rules issued by the Commission and to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to consider the cumulative effect of proposed and final rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. BURLISON):

H.R. 7031. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 7032. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide the Congressional Budget Office with necessary authorities to expedite the sharing of data from executive branch agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 7033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply a 6 percent excise tax on large endowments of certain private colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. LANDSMAN):

H.R. 7034. A bill to designate Mauritania under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Mauritania to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MANN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BOST, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr.

GOODEN of Texas, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURCHETT, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. ROY, Ms. FOX, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CLOUD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. FRY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. BICE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CAREY, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BACON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HERN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. OGLES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. MACE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STEIL, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CLINE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. CARL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. SELF, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. EZELL, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HILL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KILEY, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEEMER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 7035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7036. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify requirements relating to the regulation and examination of credit union organizations and service providers, to provide the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency with the authority to regulate the provision of services provided to the Government-sponsored enterprises and Federal Home Loan Banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 7037. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to exclude certain populations of the lake sturgeon from the authority of such Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California (for himself, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 7038. A bill to provide a guaranteed income for older youth who have exited foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 7039. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a program to provide grants to eligible recipients for eligible operating support costs of public transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7040. A bill to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BUSH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN (for himself, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. EZELL, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 7042. A bill to reform the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 7043. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to issue reports after activation of the Disaster Information Reporting System and to make improvements to network outage reporting, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. McCLAIN (for herself, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MANN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BANKS, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 7044. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are notified, before giving informed consent to receive an abortion, of the medical risks associated with the abortion procedure and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for contributions to qualifying pregnancy centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. McCLAIN, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 7046. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to modify the implementation of the adverse effect wage rate for H-2A non-immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROSENDALE, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER):

H.R. 7047. A bill to prohibit funding for the World Economic Forum; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7048. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivisions of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. OGLES, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H.R. 7049. A bill to repeal the Department of Veterans Affairs directive relating to the COVID-19 vaccination program for Veterans Health Administration health care personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7050. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the substance use disorder crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 7051. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to revise recidivist penalty provisions for child sexual exploitation offenses to uniformly account for prior military convictions, thereby ensuring parity among federal, State, and military convictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CLINE, Mr.

MOOLENAAR, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that child support for unborn children is collected and distributed under the child support enforcement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DELUZIO):

H.R. 7053. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to address measuring methane emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 7054. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to remove carbon dioxide directly from ambient air or seawater, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOLINARO, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 7055. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that the supplemental security income benefits of adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities shall not be reduced by reason of marriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILD:

H.R. 7056. A bill to prohibit the limitation of access to assisted reproductive technology, and all medical care surrounding such technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 7057. A bill to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to report to Congress annually on the threat illegal immigration poses to the financial stability of the United States and recommendations on mitigating such threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 7058. A bill to establish a Border Security Reserve Fund to be used by border States and the U.S. Border Patrol to invest in border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 972. A resolution raising awareness and encouraging the prevention of stalking by expressing support for the designation of January 2024 as "National Stalking Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDSMAN:

H. Res. 973. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should fully fund border security personnel, immigration judges, and related personnel and border technology needs at the southern border; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRY, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. LESKO, Mr.

BURLISON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. COLE, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. STRONG, Mr. HERN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SELF, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Ms. MACE, Mr. KILEY, Mr. JAMES, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BURCHETT):

H. Res. 974. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of January 21 through January 27, 2024, as "National School Choice Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOSKOWITZ (for himself and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H. Res. 975. A resolution recognizing Associated Builders and Contractors Florida East Coast Chapter and the many vital contributions merit shop commercial, industrial, and infrastructure construction contractors make to the quality of life of the people of Florida; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BACON, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 976. A resolution recognizing the roles and the contributions of Americas Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) and their critical role in providing quality health care for the public and the Nations Armed Forces for more than 150 years, through multiple public health emergencies, and beyond; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxation

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 7030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill directs the Securities and Exchange Commission to establish a rule review process and consider the cumulative costs of rules and regulations in rulemaking.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 7031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Budget Process

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 7033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply a 6 percent excise tax on large endowments of certain private colleges and universities.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate Mauritania under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Mauritania to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 7035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Estate and gift taxes

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation provides NCUA and FHFA with the authority to regulate third-party vendors that provide services to their regulated entities.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To exempt Wisconsin from any listing of the lake sturgeon under the Endangered Species Act.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California:

H.R. 7038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Guaranteed Income for Foster Youth

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 7039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Transportation

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 7041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Applies a higher corporate tax rate on companies with excessive CEO to median worker pay ratios.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 7042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following—Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reform the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 7043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Federal Communications Commission to issue reports after activation of the Disaster Information Reporting System and to make improvements to network outage reporting, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H.R. 7044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that women seeking an abortion are notified, before giving informed consent to receive an abortion, of the medical risks associated with the abortion procedure and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 7045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for donations to Pregnancy Resource Centers

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 7046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would set the Adverse Effect Wage Rate for 2024 and 2025 at the level that was in effect on December 31, 2023, and clarify job classification for H-2A workers.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign affairs

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivisions of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 7049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To repeal VHA Directive 1193.01(1) and prohibit the VA from issuing a similar directive.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 7050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

health care

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 7051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Standardizes enhanced penalties for child exploitation charges

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 7052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Social Security Act to allow retroactive child support payments to be paid to pregnant mothers.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to address measuring methane emissions when plugging abandoned and orphan oil and gas wells.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 7054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To support the development of carbon dioxide removal technologies.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 7055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill eliminates the marriage penalty in SSI for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

By Ms. WILD:

H.R. 7056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibiting the limitation of access to assisted reproductive technology, and all medical care surrounding such technology.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 7057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires the Financial Stability Oversight Council to include illegal immigration risks as an emerging threat in their annual U.S.

financial stability report and provide recommendations to Congress on how to mitigate these risks.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 7058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishes a reserve fund at the Department of the Treasury to be used by border states and the U.S. Border Patrol to invest in border security. Account is funded by confiscated unlawful narcotics seized by U.S. Custom and Border Protections. Prohibits funds to be used by sanctuary cities.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 16: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
H.R. 427: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 431: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 537: Mr. CAREY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. LATURNER, and Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 603: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 620: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 732: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 743: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 766: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 914: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 926: Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 936: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 984: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1015: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1065: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1083: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1097: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1118: Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MOSKOWITZ and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 1209: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 1213: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1222: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1235: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1247: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. LIEU, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1263: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1278: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1297: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 1328: Mr. FROST and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1369: Ms. PORTER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1413: Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 1477: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1536: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1685: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1703: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 1754: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 1788: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 1815: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1818: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1826: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 1831: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2439: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2440: Mr. CLINE and Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 2447: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2522: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 2530: Mr. KIM of New Jersey and Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 2583: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2604: Ms. MENG, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2669: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2693: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 2742: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2744: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 2757: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 2870: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2892: Mr. MOYLAN and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2923: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2955: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2976: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 3003: Mr. MILLS and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3005: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 3020: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3031: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3115: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 3151: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3243: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 3305: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3333: Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 3380: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 3409: Ms. BUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3433: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3470: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3474: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 3537: Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CHU, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3611: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3759: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 3790: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 3792: Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 3852: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3940: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 3970: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 4006: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 4041: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 4097: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4175: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 4289: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 4322: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4438: Ms. MALOY.
H.R. 4519: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H.R. 4581: Mr. TONKO and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4720: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 4758: Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. LEE of Florida.
H.R. 4771: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4798: Mr. MANN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4844: Mr. MOLINARO, Ms. BALINT, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 4848: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4867: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 4902: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 4940: Mrs. PELTOLA.
H.R. 5012: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5023: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 5048: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 5075: Ms. TLAI.
H.R. 5138: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5275: Mr. FEENSTRA.
H.R. 5419: Mrs. MCCLAIN and Ms. SCHOLTEN.
H.R. 5526: Mr. TONKO and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 5563: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 5566: Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5604: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5685: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 5779: Mr. EMMER and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 5815: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 5867: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 5976: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5995: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 6046: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. CISCOMANI.
H.R. 6090: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 6161: Ms. LEE of Nevada and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 6203: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 6232: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 6235: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 6244: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 6283: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 6394: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 6461: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6470: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. SORENSEN.
H.R. 6492: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 6530: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 6593: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 6594: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 6601: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 6619: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 6683: Ms. DE LA CRUZ and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 6734: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 6751: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 6754: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. BALINT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 6761: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6770: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 6780: Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.
H.R. 6789: Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 6810: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. LEE of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 6832: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 6835: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. WILD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6892: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 6907: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 6926: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 6937: Mr. VAN ORDEN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 6938: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 6943: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 6944: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 6950: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6962: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 6967: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 6973: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
H.R. 7015: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 7027: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 13: Ms. SALINAS.
H. Res. 154: Ms. WILD.
H. Res. 627: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 837: Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H. Res. 851: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 882: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H. Res. 915: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 941: Mr. BIGGS.
H. Res. 955: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. LEE of Florida.
H. Res. 963: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. SCANLON.
H. Res. 966: Mr. MRVAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H. Res. 967: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. MOYLAN.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—

ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions.

Petition 6 by Ms. PRESSLEY on House Joint Resolution 25: Ms. Davids of Kansas.

Petition 8 by Ms. DEGETTE on House Resolution 916: Mr. Mrvan, Ms. Adams, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Scanlon, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Espaillet, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Crow, Mr. Lieu,

Mr. Nadler, Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Moore of Wisconsin, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Wexton, Mr. Ruppersberger, Ms. Slotkin, Mr. Kim of New Jersey, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Gomez, Mrs. Ramirez, and Mr. Bowman.